

## ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. John B. Babcock, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of colonel, February 21, 1901.

Maj. John A. Johnston, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, February 21, 1901.

## MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Henry S. T. Harris, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, February 4, 1901.

## CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas C. Lebo, First Cavalry, to be colonel, February 19, 1901.

Maj. Winfield S. Edgerly, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel, February 19, 1901.

## CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. George A. Dodd, Third Cavalry, to be major, February 2, 1901.

Capt. Henry H. Wright, Ninth Cavalry, to be major, February 2, 1901.

Capt. Charles M. O'Connor, Eighth Cavalry, to be major, February 2, 1901.

First Lieut. Edward C. Brooks, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain, February 2, 1901.

First Lieut. Malvern Hill Barnum, Tenth Cavalry, to be captain, February 2, 1901.

First Lieut. Letcher Hardeman, Tenth Cavalry, to be captain, February 2, 1901.

First Lieut. Edmund S. Wright, First Cavalry, to be captain, February 2, 1901.

First Lieut. William H. Hay, Tenth Cavalry, to be captain, February 2, 1901.

## MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Charles B. Ewing, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon, with the rank of major, February 2, 1901.

Capt. Walter D. McCaw, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon, with the rank of major, February 2, 1901.

Capt. William P. Kendall, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon, with the rank of major, February 2, 1901.

## ARTILLERY CORPS.

## To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Butner, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Marcellus G. Spinks, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Jacob C. Johnson, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Henry L. Newbold, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Ernest D. Scott, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Albert G. Jenkins, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Robert E. Wyllie, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. William Forse, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Malcolm Young, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Laurence C. Brown, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

Second Lieut. Harry L. Steele, Artillery Corps, February 2, 1901.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS OF VOLUNTEERS WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

James J. Edmondson, of New York (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

Joseph C. Reifsnyder, of Pennsylvania (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

Joseph J. Curry, of Massachusetts (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

James K. Stockard, of North Carolina (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

George R. Plummer, of Florida (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

William R. Van Tuyl, of Kansas (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

John S. Fogg, of Maine (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 18, 1901.

William F. James, of Texas (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 20, 1901.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

## ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

First Lieut. Charles R. Trowbridge, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be captain, February 1, 1901.

Second Lieut. John Holtman, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, February 1, 1901.

## REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Melvin A. Deering, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Gunnison, Colo.

## ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Grover H. Lufburrow, of New Jersey, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

## POSTMASTERS.

Louis Desmarais, jr., to be postmaster at Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, La.

James Longstreet Sibley, to be postmaster at Milledgeville, Baldwin County, Ga.

Edwin S. Holcomb, to be postmaster at Westfield, Tioga County, Pa.

Irvin Ogden, to be postmaster at What Cheer, Keokuk County, Iowa.

Joseph A. McClaran, to be postmaster at Saltsburg, Indiana County, Pa.

Alexander B. Grosh, to be postmaster at New Bloomfield, Perry County, Pa.

Charles H. Stevens, to be postmaster at Perry, Shiawassee County, Mich.

John M. Clark, to be postmaster at Onaway, Presque Isle County, Mich.

Margaret Duncan, to be postmaster at Au Sable, Iosco County, Mich.

Amelia E. Roth, to be postmaster at Virginia City, Storey County, Nev.

Mathias Sailer, to be postmaster at Laurium, Houghton County, Mich.

George R. Craft, to be postmaster at North Manchester, Wabash County, Ind.

Charles Z. Landreau, to be postmaster at Mayaguez, Porto Rico.

N. A. Hummel, to be postmaster at Wadsworth, Washoe County, Nev.

Harvey E. Fitts, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Monroe County, Miss.

Jennie T. Mister, to be postmaster at Grenada, Grenada County, Miss.

Charles W. Bemis, to be postmaster at Foxboro, Norfolk County, Mass.

Frank Murphy, to be postmaster at Blandinsville, McDonough County, Ill.

Edward J. Stackpole, to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pa.

Mary Green, to be postmaster at Warrenton, Warren County, N. C.

Harry Bacharach, to be postmaster at Atlantic City, Atlantic County, N. J.

Christian A. Hanson, to be postmaster at Stoughton, Dane County, Wis.

Lehman E. Gantt, to be postmaster at Newport, Perry County, Pa.

Alfred R. Houck, to be postmaster at Lebanon, Lebanon County, Pa.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## ADMISSION TO THE HOUSE—CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit for immediate consideration a resolution which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That from midnight March 3 until 2 p. m. March 4, 1901, admission to the House wing of the Capitol shall be by the lower east door only, and no persons, except members of Congress, members-elect, and employees of the House shall be admitted except by ticket. Tickets issued under this order shall admit to all galleries of the House except the executive, diplomatic, and reporters' galleries. The number of tickets issued under this order shall not exceed three for each Member and Delegate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. I will state, Mr. Speaker—  
Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Before the gentleman from

Pennsylvania proceeds, I desire to ask him if the resolution embraces the secretaries or clerks of members? Are they included in the terms of the resolution? For if not, they ought to be.

Mr. DALZELL. They are not included expressly. They are not, I suppose, employees. The terms of the resolution are "House employees."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Some provision should be made for their admission.

Mr. DALZELL. Of course; if they are not included in the terms of the resolution, I think they ought to be. I have no objection to it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. As I understood the reading of the resolution they are not included.

Mr. DALZELL. We can easily make some arrangement which will permit them to enter the building if they are not allowed under the terms of the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I would suggest that some such provision be inserted in the resolution.

Mr. DALZELL. I have no objection—

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may we have this resolution again reported? It was not distinctly heard.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the resolution will be again read.

There was no objection, and the resolution was again read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he so modify the resolution as to include the clerks or secretaries of members.

Mr. DALZELL. The only difficulty, in my judgment, would be this: It is possible that the doorkeepers in charge of the building would not be able to recognize a number of these secretaries, not being familiar with the members' clerks. It seems to me it would be a better arrangement to allow tickets to be issued to them by the Doorkeeper or some similar arrangement which would make provision for them.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I would like to submit an inquiry to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I would like to ask if the resolution includes members-elect? As I understand it, it does not read that way.

Mr. DALZELL. They ought to be included, if they are not, in the terms of the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that they be included, so as to read, "members and members-elect."

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this contemplates giving the members-elect the same number of tickets provided for the members?

Mr. DALZELL. No; it only admits them.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I understand this resolution correctly to provide that nobody can come into the Capitol except with a ticket?

Mr. DALZELL. That is right.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. To say that nobody shall be admitted without tickets until 2 o'clock on Monday, March 4, and giving the 357 members three tickets each not more than a thousand people can be admitted into the Capitol, when perhaps 50,000 people, coming from all parts of the country, may by this resolution be denied the opportunity of getting into the building itself.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend does not understand the situation. The order now in existence in regard to this is that there shall be no admission at the other end of the Capitol except by tickets.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. At the Senate end?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; the Senate end.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is all the more reason why, in the House of the people, people ought to be admitted to the building.

Mr. DALZELL. But those who have tickets for the other end of the Capitol can come in here, and members are aware that perhaps a large number will come over here to witness the closing scenes of the House and then go to the other end of the Capitol; so, when you take that into consideration, and when you take into consideration the three tickets which are given to each member and the tickets issued—

Mr. CANNON. Two from the Senate end.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; two from the Senate end, and three tickets to the members and five to the stands and other tickets that committees have issued—when you consider all this, more people will seek to be admitted to the Capitol than can possibly get in. In all previous inaugurations entrance to the Capitol at either end has been denied save by ticket.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I was in the gallery with a constituent and did not distinctly understand the resolution. When does the resolution begin operating?

Mr. DALZELL. At midnight, March 3.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Then it is practically for the inauguration ceremony?

Mr. DALZELL. For the inauguration.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I see that the tickets, five in number, that admit our visitors to the stands here, do not admit to the Capitol. The gentleman is certainly under a misapprehension. The five tickets will not admit to the Capitol.

Mr. DALZELL. That is true; but I will say to the gentleman that there will be a modification of the order which prevents access to the platform save from the outside, so that parties having tickets to the platform who come into the Capitol may have access over the bridge.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It may be very cold, and they might want to warm here.

Mr. DALZELL. That is true, and they may do so here.

Mr. DINSMORE. I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he make it apply to ex-members also. We will have a good many friends who have been here who would like to be admitted.

Mr. DALZELL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It ought also to provide for members-elect.

Mr. DALZELL. That is already provided for.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the intention, in the interest of public business, to somewhat limit the privileges of the floor from this time on to the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. DALZELL. I have not heard of any such suggestion.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I suggest, for the consideration of the gentleman, that it will greatly aid the conduct of public business if that could be done.

Mr. DALZELL. That would require a change of the rules.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That could be done by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DALZELL. Has the gentleman a suggestion to make?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I think the privileges of the floor should be denied from this time out in the interest of public business.

Mr. DALZELL. Introduce a resolution and send it to the Committee on Rules, and it will be considered.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will not do that.

Mr. DALZELL. I consent that the resolution may be amended by adding ex-members.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the words "members-elect" the word "ex-members."

Mr. MORRIS. I ask for the reading of the resolution as amended.

The SPEAKER. It has been read twice already. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up for immediate consideration the bill H. R. 14093.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call for the special order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects and calls for the special order. Pending that, the Chair submits the following to the House:

Members of the temporary Committee on Accounts, as authorized by law, Messrs BULL of Rhode Island, JOY of Missouri, and BARTLETT of Georgia.

#### CORRECTION OF THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a correction will be made in the Journal of February 26—a clerical error by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Is it the intention of the gentleman to ask the House to go into Committee of the Whole on the revenue bill?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I want to submit to the gentleman that there are some matters of suspension, as well as conference reports upon appropriation bills, and I am informed that some other bills will



soon come over from the Senate that must receive attention. Does the gentleman from Iowa think that it is just to the public business—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to what is going on unless we can hear.

The SPEAKER. The House is in unusually good order, but the Chair can not put lungs into members. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the anxiety of the gentleman from Illinois for the dispatch of business. I remember a night or two ago how the gentleman aided in losing an hour that might have been devoted to public business. [Laughter.] This matter now in hand will not occupy, in my judgment, an hour's time. Therefore I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering House bill 5499.

Mr. CANNON. In the interest of public business I raise the question of consideration.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will say that this is in the interest of public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 5499. What is the point of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, to move to postpone the consideration of this bill until the 4th of March?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. It is the regular standing order. The motion before the House is to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON. I ask if upon that it is in order to move to lay the bill on the table?

The SPEAKER. The bill is in the Committee of the Whole and not in the House.

Mr. CANNON. I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. That will be done on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole. The motion to go into Committee of the Whole is equivalent to raising the question of consideration. The House will be able to express its desire whether to consider this bill or postpone it.

Mr. SULZER. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. I understood that the vote of the House, the overwhelming vote of the House yesterday afternoon, was to go into Committee of the Whole on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. SULZER. That is my point of order.

The SPEAKER. That was yesterday and this is to-day. [Laughter.] The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 5499.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEPBURN) there were—ayes 99, noes 84.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. MANN. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 122, nays 134, answered "present" 5, not voting 92; as follows:

## YEAS—122.

Adamson,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Salmon,
Allen, Me.	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Loving,	Shattuc,
Baker,	Fletcher,	Lybrand,	Shelden,
Bankhead,	Gardner, N. J.	McAleer,	Sheppard,
Barber,	Gibson,	McClellan,	Sherman,
Barham,	Gillet, N. Y.	McDowell,	Showalter,
Bartholdt,	Gordon,	Mahon,	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Greene, Mass.	May,	Smith, Iowa
Berry,	Griffith,	Minor,	Smith, H. C.
Breazeale,	Grosvenor,	Moody, Oreg.	Smith, Samuel W.
Brownlow,	Hall,	Morrell,	Southard,
Burnett,	Hay,	Morris,	Sperry,
Butler,	Hedge,	Muller,	Stallings,
Catchings,	Hepburn,	Naphen,	Stewart, N. J.
Clayton, Ala.	Hoffecker,	Newlands,	Sulloway,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hopkins,	Norton, S. C.	Sulzer,
Connell,	Howard,	O'Grady,	Tawney,
Cooper, Tex.	Howell,	Otey,	Taylor, Ala.
Cooper, Wis.	Jack,	Otjen,	Terry,
Corliss,	Jenkins,	Payne,	Thomas, Iowa
Cousins,	Jones, Wash.	Pearson,	Thomas, N. C.
Crowley,	Joy,	Pearre,	Tompkins,
Cushman,	Kluttz,	Phillips,	Vreeland,
Dalzell,	Lamb,	Powers,	Wanger,
Davenport, S. A.	Lane,	Ransdell,	Warner,
Davenport, S. W.	Latimer,	Rhea, Va.	Weaver,
Davis,	Lester,	Richardson, Ala.	Weymouth,
Driggs,	Lewis,	Richardson, Tenn.	Young,
Emerson,	Littauer,	Roberts,	Ziegler,
Esch,	Littlefield,	Russell,	
Finley,	Livingston,	Ryan, N. Y.	

## NAYS—134.

Adams,	Bailey, Tex.	Bishop,	Burke, S. Dak.
Aldrich,	Ball,	Boutell, Ill.	Burke, Tex.
Allen, Ky.	Barney,	Bowersock,	Burkett,
Allen, Miss.	Bell,	Brick,	Burleson,
Atwater,	Benton,	Bromwell,	Burton,
Bailey, Kans.	Bingham,	Brown,	Caldwell,

Cannon,	Haugen,	Maddox,
Capron,	Heatwole,	Mann,
Cochran, Mo.	Hemenway,	Marsh,
Cowherd,	Henry, Conn.	Meekison,
Cox,	Henry, Miss.	Mesick,
Cromer,	Henry, Tex.	Miers, Ind.
Crumpacker,	Hill,	Mondell,
Dahle,	Hitt,	Moody, Mass.
Davidson,	Hull,	Moon,
De Armond,	Jett,	Morgan,
Denny,	Johnston,	Needham,
Dinsmore,	Jones, Va.	Norton, Ohio
Dougherty,	Kerr, Md.	Olmsted,
Fitzpatrick,	Ketcham,	Overstreet,
Fleming,	Kitchin,	Parker, N. J.
Fordney,	Kleberg,	Pierce, Tenn.
Fox,	Knox,	Pugh,
Freer,	Lanham,	Quarles,
Gaines,	Lawrence,	Ray, N. Y.
Gamble,	Linney,	Reeves,
Gardner, Mich.	Little,	Rhea, Ky.
Gayle,	Lloyd,	Rixey,
Gilbert,	Long,	Robb,
Gillett, Mass.	Loud,	Robinson, Ind.
Graff,	McCall,	Robinson, Nebr.
Griggs,	McCleary,	Rucker,
Groat,	McCulloch,	Shackelford,
Grow,	McRae,	Shafroth,

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Boreing,  
Fowler,

Hamilton,

Lacey,

Landis.

## NOT VOTING—92.

Acheson,  
Alexander,  
Babcock,  
Bartlett,  
Boutelle, Me.  
Bradley,  
Brantley,  
Brenner,  
Brewer,  
Brosius,  
Broussard,  
Brundidge,  
Bull,  
Burleigh,  
Calderhead,  
Campbell,  
Carmack,  
Chanler,  
Clark,  
Clayton, N. Y.  
Conner,  
Cooney,  
Crump,

Cummings,  
Curtis,  
Cusack,  
Davey,  
Dayton,  
De Graffenreid,  
Dick,  
Dovener,  
Driscoll,  
Eddy,  
Elliott,  
Faris,  
Foss,  
Foster,  
Gaston,  
Gill,  
Glynn,  
Graham,  
Green, Pa.  
Hawley,  
Kahn,  
Kerr, Ohio  
King,

Lassiter,  
Lentz,  
Levy,  
Lorimer,  
McDermott,  
McLain,  
Mercer,  
Metcalf,  
Meyer, La.  
Miller,  
Mudd,  
Neville,  
Noonan,  
Packer, Pa.  
Pearce, Mo.  
Polk,  
Prince,  
Reeder,  
Ridgely,  
Riordan,  
Robertson, La.  
Rosenberg,  
Ruppert,

So the motion was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

On the revenue-cutter bill:

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. LACEY.

For this day:

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. CURTIS with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. CHANLER.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. KERR of Ohio with Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. STOKES.

Mr. THROPP with Mr. UNDERHILL.

For this vote:

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. KING.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. TATE.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. BULL with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. CONNER with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. DICK with Mr. CARMACK.

Mr. FARIS with Mr. BRENNER.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. CLAYTON of New York.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. COONEY.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. POLK.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. GLYNN.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROSIUS with Mr. GAINES.

Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. WILSON of New York.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. CUSACK.

Until further notice:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. BRADLEY.  
 Mr. GILL with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 Mr. REEDER with Mr. NEVILLE.  
 Mr. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.  
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.  
 Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. RIORDAN.  
 Mr. WOODS with Mr. NOONAN.  
 Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my name called. I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and in his seat and watching for his name to be called?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I was in my seat and did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman watching to hear his name called?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, and he voted "aye," as above recorded.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I observe that my pair is general. I understood it to be only on the final vote, but as it seems to be general I wish to withdraw my vote and be marked "present."

Mr. LACEY's name was called, and he voted "present," as above recorded.

Mr. TONGUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote. I was present and did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. TONGUE. I was at the second roll call, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called Mr. TONGUE's name, and he voted "no," as above recorded.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with Mr. CLARK. I was under the impression that he was present, and I voted. I desire to withdraw my vote and be marked "present."

The Clerk called Mr. LANDIS's name, and he voted "present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5715. An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. Res. 306. Joint resolution concerning printing of additional copies of the Annual Report of the Geological Survey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 13189. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13067. An act to enlarge the powers of the courts of the District of Columbia in cases involving delinquent children, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of birds, preservation of game, and for the prevention of its sale during certain closed seasons in the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolutions:

#### House concurrent resolution 84.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there be printed from the stereotype plates in the Government Printing Office 5,000 copies of House of Representatives Document No. 171, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled Agricultural Resources and Capabilities of Porto Rico, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture, the quality of paper and style of binding to be the same as in the original edition of the publication.

#### House concurrent resolution 83.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there be printed from the stereotype plates in the Government Printing Office 5,000 copies of House of Representatives Document No. 335, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled Fourth Report on the Agricultural Investigations in Alaska, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture, the quality of paper and style of binding to be the same as in the original edition of the publication.

#### House concurrent resolution 65.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there be 6,000 additional copies of the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals for the calendar year 1899, bound in cloth and

wrapped, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,000 for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Director of the Mint. *And be it further resolved,* That there also be printed 8,000 additional copies of the report of the Director of the Mint, covering the operations of the mints and assay offices of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, to be bound in cloth and wrapped, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 3,000 for the use of the Director of the Mint.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5943. An act to establish Lowelltown, Me., a subport of entry.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to House bill 13189—the river and harbor bill—and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to the river and harbor bill, and ask for a conference thereon.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order against this bill, and to suggest that there are many important amendments which I think should be considered in Committee of the Whole House, and I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION IN ARIZONA.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 10899. An act to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation in the Territory of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read and the reading of the report omitted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I would like to ask if all the conferees signed the report?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read the statement.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Alaska, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment on page 2, line 13, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 3, line 6.

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 3, lines 6 and 7.

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 3, line 10.

J. S. SHERMAN,

C. D. SHELDEN,

JOHN S. LITTLE,

Managers on the part of the House.

JNO. M. THURSTON,

J. V. QUARLES,

JAMES K. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

The Senate recedes from all amendments save one, and that one simply makes a correction in a description of property, making a course read "east" instead of "west." The conference report therefore presents the bill in the form in which it passed the House.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the report be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted was laid on the table.

#### GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The conference report on the bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report be dispensed with, and that in lieu thereof the statement of the House conferees be read.

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Insert in line 8,



page 1, after the word "assistants," the following: "Appointed by the United States district court."

Strike out the word "a," after the word "including," in line 8, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "the."

Strike out the word "an," next preceding the word "interpreter," in line 8, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "the."

Strike out, commencing at the end of line 8, page 1, the following: "Appointed by the United States district court as provided in section 34 of said act."

Strike out all of section 5, on page 3.

And the Senate agree to the same.

H. A. COOPER,  
R. R. HITT,  
W. L. JONES,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

J. B. FORAKER,  
J. H. GALLINGER,  
S. R. MALLORY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 12396, to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act, respectfully submit the following statement as to the action agreed upon in the accompanying conference report:

The first amendment proposed by the conferees is inserted for the purpose only of making clearer the intent of the section.

As now agreed upon by the conferees, the first section fixes the salary of the commissioner of education for Porto Rico at \$4,000 per annum, and empowers the executive council of Porto Rico to determine the salaries of all the officials and assistants appointed by the United States district court for Porto Rico, including the clerk and the interpreter, and also provides that they shall be paid out of the revenues of Porto Rico, as other salaries and expenses of like character are paid.

The second amendment proposed by the conferees strikes out the word "a," after the word "including," in line 8, on page 1, and inserts in lieu thereof the word "the," and is merely verbal.

The third amendment proposed by the conferees strikes out the word "an," in line 8, on page 1, and inserts in lieu thereof the word "the," and is merely verbal.

The fourth amendment proposed by the conferees strikes out certain words in order to avoid a repetition of the same words.

The fifth amendment proposed by the conferees strikes out all of section 5 of the Senate amendments. This Senate amendment related to the public lands of Porto Rico and made an appropriation of \$16,000, which the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to expend, if, in his judgment, advisable, in ascertaining the location and quantity of such lands, and in compensating a surveyor-general and the necessary clerical assistants.

Your conferees are of the opinion that, in view of all the circumstances, the whole matter of the survey of the public lands in Porto Rico should be deferred until the next session of Congress.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, allow me a word of explanation. There has recently been made a report by a commissioner appointed by the War Department to ascertain the public lands in Porto Rico, with a view to fortifying the island. That report, which, as I have said, is quite recent, has not yet been thoroughly digested; there has been no opportunity to do so; and in view of the importance of the subject the conferees were unanimously of the opinion that the whole subject had better be deferred until the next session of Congress.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can give us some approximate idea of the quantity of public lands remaining there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The governor-general wrote a letter on that subject to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Porto Rico and the Pacific Islands. As we computed the amount yesterday, it is about 120,000 acres.

Mr. GAINES. From what revenues is this superintendent of public instruction paid—from the local revenues or from the United States Treasury?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. From the revenues of the island of Porto Rico.

Mr. GAINES. Is the fixing of the salary of this officer left to the local legislature down there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is not. The gentleman misapprehends the purport of that section.

Mr. GAINES. I did not hear the report read. There was so much confusion.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. All that is left to the executive council is the fixing of the salaries of the officers and assistants appointed by the district court. The reason for enacting the law in its present form is the fact that one of the Solicitors of the Treasury rendered recently a decision in which he said that the original Porto Rican act was so worded as to preclude the payment of salaries to the clerk of the court, so that this officer was obliged to rely upon his fees. As I understand from a letter which I have recently received from Judge Holt—a letter written last week—there have been only 19 cases filed in his branch of that court at San Juan.

That would not give the clerk sufficient compensation, and the judge has paid a part of the salary out of his own pocket. In order to enable the clerk to receive a sufficient salary, we have conferred upon the executive council the authority I have just stated.

Mr. GAINES. Then Congress has created this office and authorized the compensation of the officer to be paid out of the revenues of Porto Rico.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Congress has not determined the amount of salary, but has left it to be determined at the discretion of the executive council.

Mr. GAINES. From revenues paid into the Porto Rican treasury or into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. These revenues are paid into the treasury of Porto Rico.

Mr. GAINES. Is not that contrary to the fundamental law? Does not the Constitution require that all revenues collected anywhere in the United States shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman will remember that under the Porto Rican act passed last spring a very large amount of revenue is collected from Porto Rico, something like a million and a half of dollars. Moreover, there will be in the treasury of Porto Rico additional revenue arising from local taxation upon the property of the islands to meet the insular expenses.

Mr. GAINES. What is your judgment as to whether that revenue should be paid into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know that I am here to interpret constitutional law. I am willing that the question shall be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States; and pending that decision I do not want to decide the question.

Mr. GAINES. I knew that I was asking a gentleman who is good authority, and I expected a clear-cut answer.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I prefer to leave the question to the Supreme Court of the United States—for the time being at least.

I move the adoption of the report.

The question being taken, the report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted was laid on the table.

#### ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States, by holding an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forests, and the sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report be dispensed with, and that the statement of the House conferees be read instead.

Mr. KING. I desire to reserve all points of order against this report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The gentleman from Utah reserves all points of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I desire to make a motion to recede from the disagreement of the House to the second amendment of the Senate and concur in that amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman that after this report is acted upon it will be my privilege to ask the House to further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 2, and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to dispensing with the reading of the conference report.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H. R. 9829, "An act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forests, and sea, in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

"That the House recede from its disagreeing vote on Senate amendment No. 1, and agree to the same."

That the conferees have been unable to agree to Senate amendment numbered 2, providing for the erection of a Government building and the making of a Government exhibit at the Interstate and West Indian Exposition in the city of Charleston, S. C.

J. A. TAWNEY,  
GEO. W. STEELE,  
JOHN S. WILLIAMS,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*  
CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW,  
H. C. LODGE,  
GEO. G. VEST,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forest, and the sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in the accompanying conference report on each of the Senate amendments, namely:

By the action of the conference submitted in the accompanying report, the House recedes on amendment numbered 1.

On amendment numbered 2 the conference committee were unable to agree.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to this report.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that we are entitled to know what the Senate amendments numbered 1 and 2 are. I do not think the matter is made sufficiently plain in the statement.

Mr. TAWNEY. Amendment No. 1 is what is known as the Sunday-closing amendment, and amendment No. 2 is the appropriation for the exposition at Charleston, S. C. We agree to the first amendment and disagree to the second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 2 and ask for a further conference.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I move that the House recede from its disagreement on amendment No. 2 and agree to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is first upon the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TAWNEY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rules, how much time is allowed for discussion under this proposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is entitled to the floor for one hour; he can yield such time as he may desire.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I ask the gentleman to yield me twenty minutes, as I wish to yield to other gentlemen on the floor.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not expect to occupy one-half of the time. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to occupy only three minutes of my time, and wish to be informed when that has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention when three minutes have expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the Senate in which I move to concur provides for holding an Interstate and West India Exposition at Charleston, commencing December next and lasting until the following June. The appropriation of \$250,000 that is asked for is solely for the purpose of furnishing a Government exhibit, and no part of it whatever is to be appropriated to paying the current expenses of the exposition.

Two hundred thousand dollars have already been subscribed by the citizens of Charleston and others, \$50,000 by the State of South Carolina, and \$50,000 by the city of Charleston, making in all \$300,000 already subscribed, and it is estimated that there will be, including the sale of concessions and tickets, \$1,000,000 spent in carrying it through. The greatest interest has been exhibited throughout the country in behalf of this exposition. A number of States have determined to erect buildings and furnish exhibits; also a number of cities in the North.

Everywhere throughout the country the project has been encouraged in every way, and it remains to be seen whether the House of Representatives, which is the special representative of the people of the country, will deny to us what everybody else has given. Why should we not have an appropriation of \$250,000, one-twentieth of the amount given to St. Louis? It is, as I say, purely for a Government exhibit. All the expenses of the exposition will be paid by the company that has organized it.

What excuse can be given, Mr. Speaker, for denying Charleston this small appropriation when we are giving \$5,000,000 to St. Louis, \$500,000 to Buffalo, and have heretofore made appropriations to Omaha and other cities? You will observe that this money is simply for the purpose of giving the people who visit Charleston the right and privilege of inspecting the Government exhibits, which are all the time exhibited to the public here in Washington at the expense of the Government. Why should not the people who visit the Charleston exposition have the right to see what visitors to Washington see every day? I can not imagine how gentlemen can consistently vote for these other appropriations and deny this small sum to South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Charleston have put forth the most strenuous efforts to make their exposition a success. They have planned it on broad and comprehensive lines. They have provided for 13 exposition buildings. They are making the most earnest efforts in all parts of the country to make it a national affair. They have met with no check so far, and an adverse vote here will proclaim to the world that their undertaking is unworthy of encouragement. I earnestly hope that the motion to concur will be adopted.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina means an appropriation of \$250,000 for a Government exhibit at the Southern Interstate and West Indian Exposition to be held at Charleston. I am in favor of this appropriation. I know of no reason why we should deny to the exposition

at Charleston this comparatively small sum when we have repeatedly appropriated much larger sums for like expositions in other sections of the country.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the celebration of the centennial of the Louisiana purchase. I am in favor of this appropriation, although I know that this sum is to be turned over to the commissioners to be expended in behalf of that exposition. It should be remembered that Charleston does not ask aid from the Government for the exposition itself. They only ask that the Government shall patronize the exposition to the extent of making an exhibit there, just as it has at Atlanta, Nashville, Louisville, New Orleans, Chicago, and other places.

I believe that exhibits of this kind are of great benefit to the people and to the country. They are a source of education. They give new inspiration to the genius of our country, cause our people to become better acquainted with each other, and are of lasting benefit to all concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why I shall vote for this appropriation. I remember, less than three years ago, on the floor of this House, the Representatives from South Carolina and other Southern States stood shoulder to shoulder with those from Wisconsin and the North and voted \$50,000,000 for the national defense. That act was most generously applauded. The old sectional line had been wiped out, and we all rejoiced that we were one people, having but one country and one flag. A few months after that, when volunteers had been called for and two regiments from Wisconsin, having been for weeks at Chickamauga, where they contracted the germs of typhoid, had started on their way to Porto Rico, they waited for transports at Charleston.

The transports finally sailed having the Wisconsin regiments on board, but there were left behind in the hospitals of that city 87 boys from my district and adjoining counties, sick with fever. Upon the adjournment of Congress I went down there to visit them and do what I could for their relief. The mayor of the city took me in his carriage out to the hospital. As we approached the buildings, looking out across the harbor I could see Fort Sumter, and I remembered that it was there where the first guns were fired on that dark and dreary night in April, when the storm of secession broke over this Union. I went into the hospitals, and I visited the boys. I found there Major Morgan, Captain Abel, Private Kelsey, and many others. I found there the best ladies of the city of Charleston, caring for and nursing back to life those brave Wisconsin boys who had gone out to serve their country in her hour of need. Those who had recovered sufficiently to be up and about the building told me that repeatedly the ladies had called with their carriages and taken them to drive, and had shown them every courtesy and every attention, and I want to say to you that in my judgment many of those boys owe their lives to the kind treatment received at the hands of the people of the city of Charleston. [Applause.] I went back to my home in Wisconsin and told the mothers and the families of those boys of the treatment they were receiving down at Charleston, and when the boys came home they corroborated what I had said.

From that time to this there has ever been a feeling of tenderness and affection from the people of my district toward the people of Charleston, and there is not one of the 500 boys of my district who went out with the Second Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers in the Spanish war but what wants me to show my appreciation of what Charleston did for Wisconsin by voting for this appropriation.

You may call this sentiment—and so it is—but thank God, I am not ashamed of it. There is some sentiment in it, and I think there ought to be. I would be ashamed to go back to the people of my district and say to them that after I had voted millions of dollars for commercial purposes I was afraid to vote the paltry sum of \$250,000 for the Charleston Exposition.

Believing as I do that these exhibits are of benefit to the people, and because the old sectional lines have been wiped away, and the people of the South, and especially the people of Charleston, have shown their loyalty to the flag and their affection for the people of the North, and for the boys of Wisconsin at a time when care and attention were of very material benefit to them, I shall vote for this appropriation. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will ask the other side to use some of its time.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not care to occupy any of my time now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota declines to use any part of his time now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote for this amendment. I believe in these expositions. I believe that every one of them has done a great and general good. I believe in promoting at each and every one of them a Government exhibit. As I understand it, this amendment calls for a Government exhibit. We have voted appropriations for exhibitions at Omaha, at Nashville, at Buffalo, Chicago, and Philadelphia, all of them largely



in excess of the appropriations asked for in this case. I believe Chicago was given \$5,000,000 or more, St. Louis \$5,000,000, and Buffalo \$500,000. Now, this is an interstate exposition, and not only that, but an exposition that relates to the industries of the islands of the West Indies, and I believe it will serve a good purpose. I am in favor of this amendment.

Mr. GAINES. Is this exposition at St. Louis to be closed on Sunday?

Mr. TAWNEY. The House has just agreed, by the adoption of the conference report, to the Senate amendment, which is intended to close the exhibition on Sunday.

Mr. GAINES. Then it will be closed?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not know whether it will be closed or not; whether it will have that effect I do not know.

Mr. STEELE. That is not fair; there is no question that it will be closed.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that by the adoption of the conference report it is the understanding that this exposition will be closed on Sunday.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. BROSIUS. That has been adopted.

Mr. TAWNEY. That has been adopted.

I will only occupy a few moments in answer or in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina. I am not, in opposing this motion, necessarily opposed to the South Carolina exposition, nor am I necessarily opposed to the Government appropriating a sum of money for the purpose of making an exhibit there. But in the last session of this Congress we enacted a law whereby we agreed with the people inhabiting the Louisiana territory, or the States and Territories carved out of that purchase, to appropriate \$5,000,000 to aid in carrying forward to success an exposition to commemorate that important event in our national history. The conditions upon which that promise was made were that the people in those States should raise, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$10,000,000, which they have done. With the evidence of that before us we passed this bill and sent it to the Senate, thus fulfilling our express promise. Many men voted in favor of the bill who were opposed to our making the pledge, but the pledge having been made, they felt in honor bound to keep it.

Now, those members of the House who thus voted are, by the action of the Senate in attaching to our bill carrying out this agreement a condition to appropriate money for an exposition at Charleston, placed in a position where they will have to either vote against the Government keeping its pledge or vote in favor of a proposition that they are unalterably opposed to. And it was exactly for this purpose that this amendment was made to the bill we passed. If legislation can be obtained by the aid of such methods as are being employed in respect to this amendment, then it is not necessary for this House to waste any time in the discussion of the merits of any proposition.

Why could not this proposition come before the House in a way whereby it might be considered and voted upon independent of the question of whether or not we are going to vote in favor or against the Government keeping the pledge which it made at the last session of Congress? That, Mr. Speaker, is a very substantial reason why this amendment should not be concurred in.

Mr. GAINES. Which do you think is more meritorious of the two projects—the one that makes a direct gift of \$5,000,000 to St. Louis, to do as they please with, or the one that gives \$250,000 to make a Government exhibit pure and simple in South Carolina?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman's question involves more than is the fact. We do not propose to give \$5,000,000 to the people of St. Louis for them "to do as they please with." We give it to them for the specific purpose of aiding in the success of an exposition that will commemorate an event that contributed more than any other to the industrial welfare of the people, and to the power and influence of our nation at home and abroad.

Mr. GAINES. Is it to make a Government exhibit?

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not for the purpose of making a Government exhibit, and nobody claims that it is.

Mr. GAINES. That is all that it has been heretofore, except at the Columbian Exposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. I beg to differ with the gentleman. New Orleans got \$1,250,000 from the Treasury of the United States to aid in carrying forward that exposition. The Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia got \$1,550,000.

Mr. GAINES. The last was purely national.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Chicago Exposition got over \$3,000,000.

Mr. GAINES. That was purely national.

Mr. TAWNEY. That was, and so is this; this is a national and international exhibition. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that you are asked by this amendment to invest as much money in the Government exhibit at Charleston, S. C., as there is to be invested in the entire exposition in that city by the people interested.

Now, I have here the prospectus showing that the State of South

Carolina has appropriated \$50,000, and the city of Charleston \$50,000, and the exposition company have raised in addition to that \$150,000, making a total of \$250,000.

Mr. STEELE. Let me correct the gentleman. It is not invested; with the exception of \$50,000 it is all prospective.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, no; \$200,000 has been subscribed by citizens, 3,000 subscriptions in all, showing how popular the subscription was; and all the installments have been called for except three or four, and have been paid in.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand, the purpose of the exposition at Charleston is practically the same as that of a respectable State fair, and where there would be no more reason for making the appropriation for that than there would for appropriating money for any State fair.

Mr. TAWNEY. None whatever. We are asked to invest in a Government exhibit at that exposition an amount equal to the total amount which has been subscribed, if you please, and possibly paid in, for the purpose of carrying on the exposition. In other words, the Government exhibit will be practically the whole show at this Charleston Exposition.

Now, some gentlemen on the other side appeal to the sympathy of this House on the ground that we ought not to discriminate against different sections of the country. I find, Mr. Speaker, that we have appropriated heretofore for two classes of expositions, one international and the other purely local. The Centennial Exposition was the first, and then the Columbian Exposition, and then the proposed Louisiana Exposition. Now, in addition to those three, we have had eight expositions, and of the amount appropriated by the Government either to aid in carrying forward these expositions or for the purposes of making a Government exhibit I find that \$1,990,000 went to the Southern section of our country. The South has had four of these expositions, the North four; and the Northern expositions that were purely local received \$1,660,000. As the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the Southern section has far less than one-half the population that the North has. The appropriation for the St. Louis Exposition, it may well be said, will benefit the South far more than the North. So that gentlemen have no ground to claim that we are discriminating against the Southern section of the country if we disagree to this amendment.

But there is a vast difference between these two propositions. The one is international in its character; the one commemorates one of the greatest events of the history of our country, and it will also commemorate the first great international event in our national history, while the Charleston exposition is, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said a moment ago, nothing more or less than a State fair, such as almost every State has every year; and we are asked to contribute to that fair an exhibit which will cost the Government of the United States an amount equal to the total amount invested by the people of South Carolina in that exposition.

Mr. Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH].

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to distinguish between sections of our common country in gifts of this character or between one exposition and another. They are all praiseworthy and educational. We have voted liberally for expositions in the North. This measure contains an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the St. Louis Exposition in celebration of the Louisiana purchase. It seems to me a small sum that South Carolina asks, when compared to those heretofore voted. I believe that expositions of this character are a benefit to our country. They are the gathering places of our citizens, who attain the best advantages of an educational character. They are places where new ideas get into the minds of our citizens, where genius is stimulated and invention born for the benefit of civilization and mankind; and I am willing to take this one additional step in the interest of our national fraternity and the welfare of that historical city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman think—

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I can not yield in my time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman think that this applies to the members of this House?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman will give me more time, I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, the exposition proposed to be held at Charleston, S. C., is an Interstate and West Indian Exposition. Charleston is admirably located for such a purpose. It is an historic city, full of great interest to the country and its people. It was at Charleston that one of the first victories of the Revolutionary war was won, and old Fort Moultrie still raises her historic head in that city, from whose walls Sergeant Jasper leaped and rescued the American flag when the staff had been shot away by the British invaders. It was at Charleston that the first shot of the war of the rebellion was fired, calling millions of men—fathers and sons, brothers and neighbors—to the country's service and the nation's



defense; and I shall be glad to join in celebrating the return of good will between the North and South by this splendid evidence of appreciation on the part of the Congress of the United States.

For my part, I believe that this appropriation should be given. If it is proper to give such an appropriation to Buffalo, if it was proper to give such an appropriation to St. Louis, why should we not give it to Charleston, and allow the citizens of that city and State to have an exposition worthy the period through which we are now passing, and illustrative of the genius of the age.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say a word in this debate, but I could not sit by without making a protest against the proposed appropriation for the exposition at Charleston, S. C. True, five millions are given for the St. Louis Exposition. St. Louis has raised ten millions. These five millions are a gift. St. Louis puts up two dollars to every one that the Government advances.

I stood and worked and voted as hard as I could against committing the Government to the St. Louis Exposition; but when committed, that commitment became an obligation. Now, upon a provision to meet that obligation, another body, in the closing days of this Congress, adopts this additional legislation giving \$250,000 for the purpose of having a Government exhibit at Charleston. So far as the Senate is concerned, it says to friends of the St. Louis Exposition: "The obligation to St. Louis shall not be fulfilled unless you will drag through also this appropriation for Charleston."

Now, as I have said a hundred times before, the rule is that the body which proposes legislation upon an appropriation bill must recede if the other body insists upon its objection. I have no doubt that the Senate will recede, if the House will insist on its disagreement of this amendment.

Now, upon the merits: I have no pride of opinion in regard to granting anything to any exposition; but I say respectfully it seems to me that the Charleston proposition does not commend itself to Congress. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to be appropriated by the Government, with a second \$250,000 to be subscribed in South Carolina—

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman suggests that this proposition does not commend itself to Congress. I wish to know whether any proposition for an exposition anywhere in the United States other than the exposition at Chicago, in his State, has, in the gentleman's view, commended itself to Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I made the fight on this side and against the other side—and I think I had more to do with procuring the appropriation than any other man in Congress—for the Atlanta Exposition. I made the fight for the New Orleans Exposition. I helped also in securing the appropriation for the Nashville Exposition. But this matter has reached a point now where the exposition racket runs to the point of State fairs, and soon it will extend to county fairs. [Applause.] In my judgment the time has come to call a halt.

Mr. FINLEY. I ask the gentleman to let me make one statement in connection with that which he has made.

Mr. CANNON. I have only five minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. This will only occupy a second. The gentleman stated that an appropriation of \$250,000 had been made by the city of Charleston.

Mr. CANNON. So I have been told.

Mr. FINLEY. I hold in my hand a telegram signed by the mayor of that city stating that the amount of the appropriation by the city of Charleston is \$350,000.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; I am glad if it is \$350,000. The amount was stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] as \$250,000, and he was not contradicted.

It is all very nice to talk about "the old flag and an appropriation," and about sentiment, and about "the first battle of the Revolution" (if the first battle was fought in that part of the country), and about Moultrie, and about Fort Sumter, and about the "bloody chasm," and about "the era of peace and good will." I submit that with appropriations piling up mountain high the time has come to have a little sentiment for the taxpayer. [Applause.] Therefore, I want to give notice now that to the best of my ability, my voice, weak though it may be, and my vote, though it counts but one—from this on my voice and my vote are against any and all propositions that will take money from the public Treasury for expositions. "Give us a rest." [Loud applause.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Seven minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, let us look at this matter dis-

passionately and without excitement. Let us look at it as a business proposition; for it is one of plain business. This Government is asked to spend \$250,000 in order to place its own exhibits where they can be seen at the Charleston and West Indian Exposition by visitors from every section of the country. Charleston has raised \$250,000 and the State legislature has given \$50,000. Now, will the Government do it? This money is not a gift from the Government, but only spending its own money to place upon exhibit its own resources. The gentleman from Minnesota says the St. Louis Exposition will be an international one. I say Charleston's will be a national one and will be equally as important as the other. Let us ask if South Carolina's history does not entitle her to consideration along this line, as well as the State of New York, Tennessee, Louisiana, or any other of them.

Yes, sir, the record of South Carolina in our struggle for independence can very safely challenge a comparison with any other of her sister colonies. In the patriotism of her women, none excel her, and she can recall with pride the devotion of Mrs. Motte, whose palatial residence being occupied by the British, furnished the patriots with the means of destruction of her own beautiful home. She can point with pride to the perilous trip of Emily Geiger on horseback from old Cambridge to Charleston, carrying the message to General Greene that foiled the brutal Tarleton in his murderous designs. Many other names might be mentioned, but time forbids, and then I am only speaking from memory on the spur of the moment about some of the noble women and men of my native State.

I know her statesmen were potential and prominent in the organization and establishment of our magnificent system of government. She gave to the struggling patriots the "Swamp Fox" in the person of Marion, who was never caught; the gamecock Sumter, who was never defeated, and the gallant Moultrie, who never gave up the fort; and when the chivalric Frenchman, the gallant soldier, the sincere lover of liberty, and Washington's friend and associate, Lafayette, was imprisoned in the Fortress Olmutz it was one of South Carolina's most distinguished soldiers and patriots, Colonel Laurens, who, without regard to the dangers involved in such an enterprise, at his own expense went to France and undertook to effect the release and escape of his illustrious companion in arms.

When future generations shall read the history of our Continental war, there is nothing in prose, poetry, or song, in fiction or reality, more captivating and instructive than South Carolina's part in accomplishing the independence of America. There stands to-day at the head of Broad street, in the city of Charleston, that grand old city by the sea, the very building, then used as a prison, in which patriots were confined by the Tories, and visitors may now see the very spot, with the very iron staples, in which the patriot Hayne was confined, and from which he was taken to cruel and bloody execution, and many other places may be seen there which makes Charleston one of the most historic cities in the United States.

Whatever may have been the history of South Carolina in later years I will not now speak, except to say that her sons have nothing to apologize for or to be ashamed of. I can simply refer now to her earlier actions and repeat with pride Mr. Webster's reference to Massachusetts in his famous debate with Senator Hayne, "There stands Massachusetts with her Boston Commons, her Faneuil Hall, and her Bunker Hill, and there she will stand forever." The same grand and eloquent tribute will equally apply to South Carolina, where she will stand upon her record forever. Now, Mr. Speaker, South Carolina invites her sister States to come and erect buildings there and place their products on exhibition. She asks the General Government to do so.

We invite the people from the North, South, East, and West to come to South Carolina to see our people and become better acquainted with them. Let us have this small appropriation, and come down into the country whose patriot soldiers have moistened the soil of this nation, as I have already said, upon every battlefield from Bunker Hill and Lexington to Yorktown for American liberty. Come down amongst us and see our marvelous advancement in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and all the other industries. Come down amongst and help us to prove to the world that we do not punish the most humble citizen, red, white, black, or blue, without a just cause, and help us to give the lie to the slanderous statements recently published in the North American, published in Philadelphia. [Applause.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old and a wise saying that consistency is a jewel. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has probably never heard that saying, if we are to judge by his actions, his votes, and his speeches. He has originated and passed some of the most lavish and extravagant appropriation bills.

He has advocated and voted for some of the most reckless and uncalled-for expenditures of the people's money. He has done as



much as anyone on that side of the House to make this a billion and a half dollar Congress, the most costly and expensive Congress in all the history of our country. When we compare his record with his professions, he is as disingenuous as he is inconsistent.

He is strenuously opposed now to this appropriation of \$250,000 for a Government exhibit and the necessary and incidental Government building at the Charleston Exposition. At the last moment—in the dying days of this Congress—he is awakened and rises up in patriotic indignation to sound the alarm, and in stentorian tones declare these appropriations must cease or the exchequer of the Government will be depleted. It seems to me the gentleman's good intentions are rather late, and should have been put in execution long ere this.

Sir, I am at least consistent. I am in favor of the exposition in Charleston, S. C., and I shall do all I can in my humble way to make it a success and an object lesson that will help the Southland and reflect credit on the whole country. I believe in these expositions of our progress, our industry, and our material resources.

I believe they do great good; that they are great object lessons to the people and great educators for the masses. The Government should participate in all of them and give what aid it can. The benefits to the people are inestimable and the small sum spent wise and prudent economy that will ultimately be returned an hundred fold.

Entertaining these views I shall cordially stand by my friend from South Carolina, and I trust his motion will prevail. I am on record in favor of expositions. I voted for the Omaha Exposition, for the Pan-American Exposition, for the St. Louis Exposition, and on the roll call I shall vote in favor of the Charleston Exposition. I like the people of the South; I believe in them, in their future, and I want to help them demonstrate to the world in an educational way their greatness, their grandeur, their commerce, their resources, their progress, and their material industries.

In my judgment, this exposition is most desirable and will do incalculable good. It will astonish many, and rivet the attention of America on the New South, with its innumerable opportunities, its untold wealth, and its myriad possibilities. Give the grand old South a chance, and the result will be as surprising as the vast amount of invaluable information disseminated will be beneficial.

This, sir, is not a local or a sectional matter. It will help and benefit our whole country. I dissent from the provincial and narrow view taken by some gentlemen on this question. The Columbian Exposition at Chicago did more for this country in different ways than the most eloquent tongue can ever portray.

Every exposition ever held in this country has been a great national blessing that has made for peace, for progress, and for civilization. We spend yearly millions and millions of dollars for useless objects and worthless matters, but when a few thousands of dollars are asked for educational purposes, for the benefit of humanity, for the diffusion of information, some all-wise and far-seeing cheese-paring statesman gravely arises and in sepulchral tones objects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. I am more than delighted to know that there is at least one voice upon the Republican side that is raised against the reckless appropriations made by this Congress.

Unfortunately, his voice, so far as its influence upon the Republicans is concerned, is like "one crying in the wilderness."

And yet my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is not entitled to much credit for his plea for economy. It is a death-bed repentance. Millions and hundreds of millions were appropriated this session, and he felt no duty resting upon him to warn the majority in Congress to halt in their wild and heedless efforts to plunder the public Treasury. Democrats upon this side of the House again and again raised their voices against the maladministration of the party in power, and the unconstitutional, unwarranted, and meretricious "grabs" which were made upon the National Treasury.

When nearly a billion dollars have been taken from the people in three months, then a faint voice is heard from the darkness of Republican jungles, crying out in doleful and lugubrious sounds, "We are lost; woe is me!"

And yet, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fairness and truth I am compelled to say that, in my humble opinion, the record of some members upon this side of the Chamber in regard to certain appropriations is not free from criticism.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have come to believe that no proposition can be suggested in a legislative body, which involves the appropriation of money from the Treasury,

that can not be supported by some kind of an argument and some show of reason.

We hear that we should appropriate \$5,000,000 for the St. Louis fair because it commemorates the splendid achievement of Jefferson in securing by peaceful means a great empire; and that we should give to South Carolina \$250,000 because of "sentiment."

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this whole scheme. I think it is wrong and indefensible to take the people's money, as it is proposed by the bill under consideration. I voted against the St. Louis proposition. If it were within my power I would defeat the scheme by which \$5,000,000 are taken from the people and turned over to a private corporation in the city of St. Louis.

The whole system is wrong. We are running wild upon the subject of "fairs" and "expositions."

It is an easy thing, apparently, to organize a private corporation, subscribe a few dollars, and then lobby through Congress a bill to put into the treasury of the corporation hundreds of thousands of dollars, and even millions, for the ostensible purpose of having a "fair." When is this thing to end?

One State asks to-day, to-morrow another makes its appearance, and next week some county will be heard from. Of course each "exposition" is "international." By labeling it "international" the robbery of the Treasury becomes a virtue.

It is similar to the villainies found in the river and harbor bills; a dribbling, shallow creek is called a "river," and forthwith it becomes so important for "commerce" that an appropriation should be made to widen and deepen it.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Constitution, although the party in power treats it with supreme contempt. There are limitations placed upon the legislative department of the Government. It is a crime to tax the people for any purpose other than to raise revenue for the economical administration of the affairs of the Government.

It is revolutionary to use the taxing power to aid private enterprises. All history teaches that the persistent and flagrant abuse of this sovereign power is destructive of liberty, and the sure precursor of tyranny.

I am interested in the great State of South Carolina. I am proud of her history, and glory in her mighty achievements. I hold in sacred memory the illustrious Democrats who have held her banner.

In all that will advance her interests I shall rejoice. But I hope I may never support a proposition that I regard as a violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States, no matter how apparently beneficial it may seem to the great State of South Carolina or any other State of our Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I just wish to say one word. It is estimated that the expense of this exposition outside of the Government appropriation will be \$1,000,000.

I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague [Mr. LATIMER].

Mr. LATIMER. I yield two minutes of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX].

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, the other day, when this appropriation was up, I opposed the appropriation for the St. Louis fair, and referred to this that was to follow. Now, I am like my friend from Illinois. I think the time has come, on this question, when there should be a halt upon these appropriations; but I can not see how this House can stand here and propose to make an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the St. Louis fair and refuse an appropriation to the city of Charleston.

But our friends on the other side, and especially the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Illinois, say that we have obligated ourselves at a previous Congress to make this appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the St. Louis fair. Let me call your attention to another thing. On the 19th day of April, 1898, you obligated yourselves to the world and especially to Cuba to do certain things; and I say now that before the sun sets you will violate those obligations openly and aboveboard [Applause.] Now, see if you do not do that; see where your obligations lead you, and see if you are as loyal to the obligations you made on April 19, 1898, as you are to the St. Louis fair.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. There is no more time remaining.

Mr. LATIMER. I had three minutes.

The SPEAKER. You yielded two minutes; your colleague used half a minute, and now the time has all expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague have two minutes. He yielded under a misapprehension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to appeal to this House and gentlemen to show now that you feel and will act in accordance with the expressions that have been given out by the President of the United States and members on the floor of this House in regard to the hostilities that have been exhibited for the last twenty-five

years toward the South and especially toward South Carolina. This is an opportunity to show absolutely that the feeling of hostility toward the South, and toward South Carolina, has been obliterated. This is the first time that South Carolina has come before Congress and asked for an appropriation from the National Government. This is an opportunity to show that State that you feel toward her just as you feel toward St. Louis, Chicago, and New Orleans, and Buffalo. This is a small appropriation, and I hope this House will vote for it, and agree to the Senate amendment, keeping this \$250,000 in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] says this is a business proposition. I thoroughly agree with him in that statement, and it is because the business end of the proposition is all on the side of the Charleston exposition that I object to the appropriation of the money carried by this amendment. You come to Congress and demand that we make an exhibit there wholly disproportionate to the character of the exposition which you propose holding. This is the result of tacking onto the bill which we passed and sent to the other end of the Capitol a proposition wholly different and not germane. It comes to us now in such a way that the House can not consider, correct, or amend any defects that exist in the Senate amendment.

This, Mr. Speaker, is alone a sufficient reason why this amendment should not be concurred in. By this amendment the House is literally held up. You will now either vote against keeping the promises which you have made to the people of St. Louis or else you will vote in favor of a proposition which, if it stood alone in its present form, would not receive any favor whatever in this House. The plea made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] in favor of this proposition, that it would be the highest evidence of the complete wiping out of sectional lines, has no foundation in fact. We have been appropriating money for the purpose of making exhibits at Southern expositions ever since 1884. We appropriated in 1884 for the New Orleans Exposition \$1,350,000, and in addition to that we appropriated \$300,000 for a building and exhibit.

We appropriated for the Louisville Exhibition; we appropriated for the Atlanta exposition, and we also appropriated for the Nashville Exposition. It is not on that ground, it is not because it is in the South, that I object to this proposition, but I object to having the proposition coupled with a bill that is intended only to carry out our agreement, a proposition that otherwise many members of this House would oppose, and I should oppose in its present form. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEELE. I demand the yeas and nays on this.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 91, nays 164, answered "present" 9, not voting 89; as follows:

## YEAS—91.

Adamson,	Esch,	Lybrand,	Ryan, N. Y.
Alexander,	Finley,	McAleer,	Salmon,
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Marsh,	Shackleford,
Barham,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	May,	Shafroth,
Bellamy,	Gibson,	Meekison,	Showalter,
Bingham,	Gordon,	Morrell,	Slayden,
Brantley,	Green, Pa.	Muller,	Smith, Iowa
Breazeale,	Grout,	Newlands,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brownlow,	Hall,	Norton, Ohio	Spight,
Burleigh,	Hay,	Norton, S. C.	Stark,
Burnett,	Hepburn,	Packer, Pa.	Sulzer,
Caldwell,	Hoffecker,	Pearson,	Sutherland,
Clayton, N. Y.	Howell,	Polk,	Swanson,
Cusack,	Jack,	Powers,	Talbert,
Davenport, S. A.	Jenkins,	Ransdell,	Taylor, Ala.
Davenport, S. W.	Knox,	Ray, N. Y.	Thayer,
Davey,	Lacey,	Richardson, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Davidson,	Lane,	Riordan,	Tompkins,
Davis,	Latimer,	Rixey,	Wachter,
Denny,	Lester,	Robertson, La.	Waters,
Dick,	Lewis,	Robinson, Nebr.	Weymouth,
Driggs,	Littlefield,	Rucker,	Young.
Elliott,	Livingston,	Ruppert,	

## NAYS—164.

Acheson,	Brundidge,	Dinsmore,	Hedge,
Adams,	Burke, S. Dak.	Driscoll,	Hemenway,
Aldrich,	Burke, Tex.	Eddy,	Henry, Conn.
Allen, Ky.	Burkett,	Fletcher,	Henry, Miss.
Allen, Miss.	Burleson,	Fordney,	Henry, Tex.
Atwater,	Butler,	Fox,	Hill,
Babcock,	Calderhead,	Freer,	Hopkins,
Bailey, Tex.	Cannon,	Gaines,	Hull,
Baker,	Capron,	Gamble,	Jett,
Ball,	Carmack,	Gardner, N. J.	Johnston,
Barber,	Clayton, Ala.	Gilbert,	Jones, Va.
Barney,	Cochrane, N. Y.	Gillet, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.
Bartholdt,	Connell,	Gillet, Mass.	Joy,
Bell,	Cooper, Wis.	Graff,	Ketcham,
Benton,	Cooney,	Greene, Mass.	King,
Berry,	Corliss,	Griffith,	Kitchin,
Boutell, Ill.	Cousins,	Grosvenor,	Kleberg,
Bowersock,	Cowherd,	Grow,	Klutz,
Brick,	Cromer,	Hamilton,	Lamb,
Bromwell,	Crowley,	Haugen,	Lanham,
Brosius,	Crumpacker,	Hawley,	Lawrence,
Brown,	Dalzell,	Heatwole,	Levy,

Linney,	Morris,	Ryan, Pa.	Tate,
Littauer,	Needham,	Shattuck,	Tawney,
Little,	Olmsted,	Sheppard,	Taylor, Ohio
Lloyd,	Otjen,	Sherman,	Terry,
Long,	Overstreet,	Sibley,	Thomas, Iowa
Loudenslager,	Parker, N. J.	Sims,	Turner,
Lovering,	Payne,	Smith, Ky.	Vandiver,
Mahon,	Pearce, Mo.	Smith, H. C.	Van Voorhis,
Mann,	Pearre,	Snodgrass,	Vreeland,
McCall,	Phillips,	Southard,	Wadsworth,
McCleary,	Pierce, Tenn.	Sperry,	Wanger,
McLain,	Pugh,	Sprague,	Watson,
Miers, Ind.	Rhea, Ky.	Stallings,	Weaver,
Miller,	Richardson, Ala.	Steele,	Weeks,
Mondell,	Robb,	Stephens, Tex.	Williams, J. R.
Moody, Mass.	Roberts,	Stevens, Minn.	Williams, Miss.
Moody, Oreg.	Robinson, Ind.	Stewart, N. J.	Wright,
Moon,	Rodenberg,	Stewart, N. Y.	Zenor,
Morgan,	Russell,	Stewart, Wis.	Ziegler.

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Bishop,	Fowler,	Landis,	Meyer, La.
Cox,	Gardner, Mich.	Maddox,	Wheeler.
Fleming,			

## NOT VOTING—89.

Allen, Me.	Dayton,	Lorimer,	Scudder,
Bailey, Kans.	De Armond,	Loud,	Shelden,
Bartlett,	De Graffenreid,	McClellan,	Small,
Boreing,	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Smith, Ill.
Boutelle, Me.	Dovener,	McDermott,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bradley,	Emerson,	McDowell,	Spalding,
Brenner,	Farris,	McRae,	Sparkman,
Brewer,	Fitzpatrick,	Mercer,	Stokes,
Broussard,	Foss,	Mesick,	Sulloway,
Bull,	Foster,	Metcalf,	Thropp,
Burton,	Gaston,	Minor,	Tongue,
Campbell,	Gayle,	Mudd,	Underhill,
Catchings,	Gill,	Naphen,	Underwood,
Chanler,	Glynn,	Neville,	Warner,
Clark,	Graham,	Noonan,	White,
Cochran, Mo.	Griggs,	O'Grady,	Williams, W. E.
Conner,	Hitt,	Otey,	Wilson, Idaho
Cooper, Tex.	Howard,	Prince,	Wilson, N. Y.
Crump,	Kahn,	Quarles,	Wilson, S. C.
Cummings,	Kerr, Md.	Reeder,	Woods.
Curtis,	Kerr, Ohio	Reeves,	
Cushman,	Lassiter,	Rhea, Va.	
Dahle,	Lentz,	Ridgely,	

So the motion was rejected.

The following additional pairs were announced:

For this day:

Mr. DAHLE with Mr. McCULLOCH.

Mr. BULL with Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS.

For this vote:

Mr. CONNER with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas with Mr. BREWER.

Mr. O'GRADY with Mr. GASTON.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. HITT with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. BURTON with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. MESICK with Mr. RHEA of Virginia.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. GLYNN.

Mr. KERR of Maryland with Mr. McRAE.

Until further notice:

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. CATCHINGS.

On Charleston amendment:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. COX.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. STOKES.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I was present and listening, but did not hear my name called, and I desire to vote.

The name of Mr. NEWLANDS was called, and he voted as above recorded.

The result was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TAWNEY], that the House further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 2 and ask for a further conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as managers on the part of the House Mr. TAWNEY, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

## ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, having under consideration House resolution No. 441, report the same herewith with a recommendation that it be agreed to:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the Army and without intervening motion to move to concur in the Senate amendments thereto in gross: after two hours' debate (one hour on each side) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said motion, and a vote then be had thereon without delay or intervening motion.

Mr. DALZELL. Upon that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question.



The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. HAY. A division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEELE. The call for a division came too late. It came after the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was putting it rapidly, not anticipating any opposition, and the gentleman was cut off from a fair opportunity to demand a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 118, noes 93.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 120, answered "present" 4, not voting 90; as follows:

## YEAS—139.

Acheson,	Davenport, S. A.	Kerr, Md.	Pugh,
Adams,	Dick,	Ketcham,	Ray, N. Y.
Aldrich,	Dovenor,	Knox,	Roberts,
Alexander,	Eddy,	Lacey,	Rodenberg,
Babcock,	Emerson,	Lane,	Russell,
Bailey, Kans.	Esch,	Lawrence,	Shattuc,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Littlefield,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Fordney,	Loudenslager,	Showalter,
Berry,	Freer,	Lovering,	Sibley,
Bingham,	Gamble,	Lybrand,	Smith, Ill.
Bishop,	Gardner, N. J.	McCleary,	Smith, Iowa
Boutell, Ill.	Gibson,	Mahon,	Southard,
Bowersock,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mann,	Spalding,
Brick,	Gillet, Mass.	Marsh,	Steele,
Bromwell,	Graft,	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Brosius,	Greene, Mass.	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. J.
Brown,	Grosvenor,	Miller,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brownlow,	Grout,	Minor,	Stewart, Wis.
Burke, S. Dak.	Grow,	Mondell,	Tawney,
Burkett,	Hamilton,	Moody, Oreg.	Taylor, Ohio
Burleigh,	Haugen,	Morrell,	Thomas, Iowa
Butler,	Heatwole,	Morris,	Tompkins,
Calderhead,	Hedge,	Mudd,	Van Voorhis,
Cannon,	Hemenway,	Needham,	Vreeland,
Capron,	Henry, Conn.	O'Grady,	Wachter,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Connell,	Hill,	Otjen,	Warner,
Conner,	Hitt,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Corliss,	Hoffecker,	Parker, N. J.	Weaver,
Cousins,	Hopkins,	Payne,	Weeks,
Cromer,	Howell,	Pearson,	Weymouth,
Crumpacker,	Hull,	Pearre,	White,
Curtis,	Jack,	Phillips,	Wright,
Cushman,	Jenkins,	Powers,	Young,
Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.	Prince,	

## NAYS—120.

Adamson,	Dougherty,	Lloyd,	Ruppert,
Allen, Ky.	Finley,	McAleer,	Ryan, N. Y.
Atwater,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McClellan,	Ryan, Pa.
Bailey, Tex.	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McCulloch,	Salmon,
Ball,	Fleming,	McDermott,	Scudder,
Bankhead,	Fox,	McLain,	Shackelford,
Barber,	Gaines,	McRae,	Shafroth,
Bellamy,	Gilbert,	Maddox,	Sheppard,
Benton,	Gordon,	May,	Sims,
Brantley,	Green, Pa.	Meekison,	Slayden,
Breazeale,	Griffith,	Miers, Ind.	Smith, Ky.
Broussard,	Griggs,	Muller,	Snodgrass,
Burke, Tex.	Hall,	Napthen,	Stallings,
Burleson,	Hay,	Newlands,	Stark,
Caldwell,	Henry, Miss.	Norton, Ohio	Stephens, Tex.
Carmack,	Henry, Tex.	Otey,	Sulzer,
Clayton, Ala.	Jett,	Pierce, Tenn.	Swanson,
Cochran, Mo.	Johnston,	Polk,	Talbert,
Cooney,	Jones, Va.	Quarles,	Tate,
Cooper, Tex.	King,	Ransdell,	Terry,
Cowherd,	Kitchin,	Rhea, Ky.	Thayer,
Cox,	Kleberg,	Rhea, Va.	Thomas, N. C.
Crowley,	Klutz,	Richardson, Ala.	Turner,
Cusack,	Lamb,	Richardson, Tenn.	Underwood,
Davenport, S. W.	Lanham,	Riordan,	Vandiver,
Davey,	Latimer,	Rixey,	Wheeler,
Davis,	Levy,	Robb,	Williams, J. R.
De Armond,	Lewis,	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, Miss.
Denny,	Little,	Robinson, Nebr.	Wilson, Idaho
Dinsmore,	Livingston,	Rucker,	Zenor.

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Glynn,	Landis,	Meyer, La.	Smith, H. C.
--------	---------	------------	--------------

## NOT VOTING—90.

Allen, Me.	Dahle,	Lentz,	Small,
Allen, Miss.	Davidson,	Lester,	Smith, Samuel W.
Baker,	Dayton,	Linney,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Barham,	De Graffenreid,	Littauer,	Sparkman,
Bartlett,	Driggs,	Long,	Sperry,
Bell,	Driscoll,	Lorimer,	Spight,
Boreing,	Elliott,	Loud,	Sprague,
Boutelle, Me.	Faris,	McCall,	Stokes,
Bradley,	Fitzpatrick,	McDowell,	Sulloway,
Brenner,	Foss,	Mesick,	Sutherland,
Brewer,	Foster,	Moody, Mass.	Taylor, Ala.
Brundidge,	Fowler,	Moon,	Thropp,
Bull,	Gardner, Mich.	Morgan,	Tongue,
Burnett,	Gaston,	Neville,	Underhill,
Burton,	Gayle,	Noonan,	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Gill,	Norton, S. C.	Waters,
Catchings,	Graham,	Packer, Pa.	Williams, W. E.
Chanler,	Hawley,	Pearce, Mo.	Wilson, N. Y.
Clark,	Howard,	Reeder,	Wilson, S. C.
Clayton, N. Y.	Joy,	Reeves,	Woods,
Cooper, Wis.	Kahn,	Ridgely,	Ziegler.
Crump,	Kerr, Ohio.	Robertson, La.	
Cummings,	Lassiter,	Shelden,	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

On this vote:

Mr. BARHAM with Mr. GLYNN.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. BELL.

Mr. JOY with Mr. RIDGELY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. FARIS with Mr. BRENNER.

Mr. BULL with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. SPRAGUE with Mr. ZIEGLER.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

Mr. SHELLEN with Mr. UNDERHILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. McDOWELL.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition at this time to discuss any of the questions that may be incidentally involved in the discussion of this rule. The proposition embodied in the rule is that the Army appropriation bill, which comes back from the Senate with sundry amendments, shall be voted upon on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments, and the proposition is that there shall be two hours' debate—one hour on either side.

In addition to that, of course, there are forty minutes, under the rules of the House, for debate on the rule—twenty minutes on either side. As far as my twenty minutes are concerned, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman to say that we shall have forty minutes' debate on the rule.

Mr. DALZELL. That is the understanding.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are brought by this rule to the consideration of one of the most important legislative subjects ever presented to the American Congress. This rule forces a vote of the House of Representatives, after one hour's debate, upon a general appropriation bill carrying appropriations for the Army for the next fiscal year, loaded down with the most offensive, obnoxious, and unconstitutional provisions that were ever ingrafted, in my judgment, upon a bill presented to the American Congress.

Mr. Speaker, these provisions of legislation are ingrafted upon this general appropriation bill in defiance of every sound legislative principle and in absolute defiance of the rules of this House. The rules expressly provide that no such legislation shall go upon a general appropriation bill; and yet in defiance of that provision we are brought to the consideration of these far-reaching and most monstrous propositions. We are to have no opportunity to offer a single, solitary amendment to them or even discuss them before the House and country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this rule ought to be voted down. We propose in these amendments—and I shall not have an opportunity to refer to them except in the briefest manner—by one of them we are called upon to make legislative provision for 10,000,000 people in the Philippine Islands. We send to govern them a commission composed of five men, or, what would be worse, a military governor, who is to have no restraint placed upon him except his own sweet will and the instructions of the Chief Executive of this nation.

He is not required to support the Constitution of the United States, and such an obligation may not be put upon him here. The rights of these ten millions of people are wholly disregarded, and they are to be governed indefinitely under the provisions of this bill. Some gentlemen, justifying their action in voting for these Senate amendments, may cite the Louisiana purchase. They may cite other precedents in our history and undertake to say they find something to warrant this far-reaching and unconstitutional legislation, but I deny it.

I deny that there is anything comparable in the government of the Louisiana territory in 1803 with the methods contemplated in this bill. Why, Mr. Speaker, if gentlemen are satisfied with the provisions as to the Louisiana purchase, let them present that here as a substitute for the pending provision for the Philippine Islands and there will be no division between the parties. If they are sincere in citing that as a precedent, let them tender the same plan for the government of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill there will be a government set up in the Philippines over 10,000,000 people who are denied every guaranty given by our Constitution—the right of trial by jury, the right of representation, the right to a voice in their government—and must submit to oppressive taxation without representation of any kind or character. A party founded on freedom, as our friends on the other side claim their party was founded, a party brought into its existence to give freedom to a suffering people, are now proposing to place upon 10,000,000 subjects of America a slavery more galling, if possible, than was ever known in our history or was applicable to those in African slavery.



No right to trial by jury; no constitutional restrictions; no obligations to control them; nothing except the arbitrary will of the men who are sent there to govern them. All the sacred guarantees in the bill of rights are denied them. They are not to look with favor to any provision in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the country under which they live—the Constitution of their country does not apply to them.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is contrary to the traditions and principles of Republicanism and Democracy and every other party that ever existed in this Republic. This rule ought to be voted down for the reasons I have mentioned. In addition to that the Senate amendments deal with Cuba. On April 20, 1898, we gave the people of Cuba and the world a solemn pledge that in waging war on Spain we did not do so for conquest, and did not intend to interfere with the people of Cuba except to give them a stable government and insure them their independence.

Our solemn declaration was—

That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

And again:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

This bill denies to the people of Cuba a free, independent government. Yet we are not to be permitted to amend it; we are not permitted to mention in detail the provisions of the bill, because it can not be done in the short space of an hour. No man can discuss this measure properly if he consumed all the time given for the discussion. I take it that the majority have prepared their minds to vote to concur in the Senate amendments in gross. On yesterday they were ready to nonconcur, and a resolution was presented and reported to the House proposing to nonconcur in these amendments. To-day this great party in the majority, without a policy, it seems, as to these foreign subjects, reverses its action of yesterday and now comes and proposes to concur in every amendment proposed by the Senate.

Mr. GAINES. Just a moment for a question. The gentleman says that this proposed law is different from the law which was passed with relation to Louisiana and Florida. Does not the main difference consist in the fact that under this bill the President is to make the law, whereas in the other cases the President executed the existing law?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Undoubtedly that is so; but a still greater difference is that in the former cases the Government by the President was temporary. There was a time at which they died.

Mr. GAINES. Louisiana act continued eleven months exactly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If we had the opportunity to amend this bill we might provide that at the end of the next Congress the government now put in force should cease to operate, but now no provision of that kind is offered. The proposition is simply that this form of government shall last indefinitely, because when this bill is once passed there will be no opportunity ever to change the law until there shall be a Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic House of Representatives. And I say, Mr. Speaker, God speed the time when these blessings shall rest upon our Republic. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Of course, Mr. Speaker, in five minutes it would be utterly impossible to discuss the question before the House. We now have the first test, the first real, definite Congressional test of imperialism upon these mighty issues. Heretofore, with Congress shirking its duty, with Congress hesitating to act, with Congress willing to let the Constitution and the traditions of the country be disregarded and violated, the President has ruled with the hand and the power of an emperor. Now, with no opportunity for discussion, scarcely with the opportunity even for a protest, we are to have imperialism sanctioned by the Congress of the United States. There is thrust into this Chamber now, by the tyranny of the majority, by the connivance of others who had power and did not use it, a mighty question, which can not be considered here, but which is to be settled here.

In the closing hours of this session the body which could have prevented, the men who could have barred from this Chamber these great questions, for reasons of their own which I have not time to bring into light and upon which I do not care now to enter—for reasons of their own, yielding to inducements sufficiently powerful upon them and with them, have allowed this measure to come with these amendments to this House; and the House, taking the bidding of its master; the House, ready to surrender its prerogatives; the House, obedient and subservient, denies the right of debate which might be given, shrinks from the discussion of an hour or two, which might easily be given in addition to what is given, rushes blindly along the pathway of imperialism, spits

upon the honor and the pledge of this great Government, dishonors the United States of America, and wrongs millions in the Philippines and in Cuba. Ah, weak, ignoble House! Ah, mean and contemptible tyranny—abject evidence of abject slavery!

There never has been a day fuller of fate for freedom and liberty in the Republic of the United States than this; and here, with the representatives of the American people shackled with trades and bargains and connivance, with cringing and bending of the knee that thrift may follow fawning, the rights of the American people are to be frittered away, their Constitution is to be disregarded, the people in the far-away Philippines are to be outraged, the risk of war in Cuba is to be hazarded, and all, all that those subservient enough to do it may register the decrees of imperial majesty here in the Congress of the United States of America; and, shame upon shame, this is to be done here in what is supposed to be the House of Representatives of the American people, but which really is the House of Representatives of the bosses and the managers and the traders and the traffickers, those who have no respect for the Constitution, those who have no respect for their constituencies, those who have no respect for what ought to be their own manhood, those who surrender their every right, those who grovel in the dust and seem to rejoice that they are so constituted that they may crawl instead of standing erect, as God probably intended that they should do. [Applause.]

If I had the time I would be glad to discuss this infamous measure. I would be glad to discuss the infamous procedure, the infamous surrender, the infamous cowardice, the infamous trading and trafficking, the infamous disregard of everything sacred and holy and decent and honorable and glorious in these United States of America. But the time is lacking. The people abroad, perhaps, in their day (for their day, I hope in the good providence of God, is coming) probably the people abroad may brand as they deserve, and may lash from public places, as ought to be done, the recreant men—men in appearance—recreant creatures, who are ready now to surrender everything and forego everything that is decent, honorable, and constitutional, and right—everything that has tended to make our nation glorious, and who resort willingly to everything that may make it infamous now and in all the hereafter.

I commend to the tyrants here, I commend to the sycophants and the traders and the traffickers elsewhere, the plunder they get. For one, I will stand here, even in the brief time that I have, true to my conceptions of the Constitution of my country, of the honor of the great Republic, of our duties to our own people and to civilization, and protest. I condemn, fruitlessly though it may be here, the infamy that you are perpetrating. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE].

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, this rule introduced here comports most harmoniously with the purposes which it seeks to accomplish. Resorted to in violation of all the observances of the House, in violation of our laws, with the deliberate purpose of imposing upon the country an infraction of every tradition, an abandonment of every principle we have professed, an absolute reversal of our history as a nation; and you propose to drag down the honored name of the Republic in the dust, to crush out liberty where we have promised to establish it, to break national faith, to violate our publicly proclaimed national promise, and for what? From motives of greed and lust of power alone.

Mr. Speaker, the die is cast; the purpose has been deliberately formed and will be relentlessly carried out, to go forward and fix the position of the United States amongst the nations of the earth as the oppressor of humanity rather than as heretofore the friend and the uplifter of the oppressed.

For one, while we have not the opportunity to discuss the infamous features of the measure proposed, and shall not have, for you dare not let us discuss it, I shall at least in the remainder of my life regard with satisfaction the fact that I had the opportunity, even though by but a word, to express my unutterable abhorrence of such infamous conduct.

What is it we do? I must put it in two brief propositions. We establish a tyrannous rule in the Philippine Islands against their will, depriving the inhabitants of the most valued and valuable rights of self-government, denying to them the right of citizenship, and make them subject entirely to the will of the President of the United States, the laws being administered by officers upon whom there is not imposed even the obligation of an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

On the other hand, after we made war against Spain to make the Cubans free and solemnly declared that we had no motive of conquest, that we had no intention of exercising sovereignty or jurisdiction except for the pacification of the island, and that when this was accomplished our forces should be withdrawn for



the Cuban people were and of right should be free and independent, it is now proposed to force upon them permanently our own superintendence, and to require them, by the amendments on the pending bill, to recognize in their constitution, their organic law, our right to intervene when we see fit, to enforce a government such as we think is required to preserve life, property, and liberty.

Whatever gentlemen may think of the importance of American domination of Cuba, we may, under invocation of the Monroe doctrine, enforce our every right, a policy which we have never asserted in vain and under which we could continue honorably to protect all our interests; but even if we should suffer I hold that the preservation of a nation's honor is of the highest importance and that its plighted faith must be kept.

In all business and social relations society has laid upon the individual an obligation to keep his word, to perform his promise, and he can not, without the sacrifice of honor, break it. It is no less binding upon nations, and that man is no friend to his country who would have it violate this law. Commercial spirit has made us mad, and greed has taken the place in the hearts of men where patriotism should abide. Shall we, who struck the foremost nation in all this world to achieve our liberty, sell the mighty span of our large honors for so much trash as may be granted thus?

You steal away the liberties of men. It is not only an assault upon the liberties of the Filipinos and of the Cubans that you make, but it is an attack upon liberty everywhere, and one which threatens every household in our own land, because if we can force upon others this obnoxious and wrongful oppression it will ultimately steal away the liberties of Americans themselves. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have only one minute left, and I hope the gentleman will use some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Nineteen minutes and a half.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Democratic members of this Congress to the excellent precedent for the bill which is denounced now as tyrannous. I want to invite their attention to the act of 1803, in the second General Statutes, page 245, enacted under Jefferson's Democratic Administration, providing:

#### JEFFERSON'S PLAN FOR LOUISIANA IN 1803.

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Approved October 31, 1803.

In 1804, the following year, a further act was passed, which is found in the Second Statutes at Large, page 284:

#### JEFFERSON'S PLAN FOR LOUISIANA IN 1804.

SEC. 4. The legislative powers shall be vested in the governor and in thirteen of the most fit and discreet persons of the Territory, to be called the legislative council, who shall be appointed annually by the President of the United States from among those holding real estate therein, and who shall have resided one year at least in the said Territory and hold no office of profit under the territory of the United States.

The governor, by and with advice and consent of the said legislative council or of a majority of them, shall have power to alter, modify, or repeal the laws which may be in force at the commencement of this act. Their legislative powers shall also extend to all the rightful subjects of legislation; but no law shall be valid which is inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, or which shall lay any person under restraint, burden, or disability on account of his religious opinions, professions, or worship, in all which he shall be free to maintain his own and not burdened for those of another.

The governor shall publish throughout the said Territory all the laws which shall be made, and shall from time to time report the same to the President of the United States, to be laid before Congress; which, if disapproved by Congress, shall thenceforth be of no force. The governor or legislative council shall have no power over the primary disposal of the soil, nor to tax the lands of the United States, nor to interfere with the claims to land within the said Territory. The governor shall convene and prorogue the legislative council whenever he may deem it expedient. It shall be his duty to obtain all the information in his power in relation to the customs, habits, and dispositions of the inhabitants of the said Territory and communicate the same from time to time to the President of the United States.

These were the Democratic provisions for the government of the Territory of Louisiana from which the bill, which is now criticised, has substantially been copied. And it was under these laws that the region now occupied in part by Iowa was governed for many years.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If you will give us the provisions of that bill we will take it now.

Mr. LACEY. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his suggestion, but he will find on examination that the proposition in the present bill is the same as that of Jefferson's governmental act for Louisiana in 1803, only slightly modified to adapt it to the existing conditions in the Philippines.

I will read the propositions of the present bill, inviting the attention of the House to its close adherence to the lines marked out by the fathers in 1803 with regard to the government of Louisiana.

You will note that the differences are in the nature of limitations

on the power of the Government to legislate, which were not contained in the Louisiana act. The following is the proposition of the present bill:

#### PROPOSITIONS AS TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1901.

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: *Provided*, That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago full reports shall be made to Congress on or before the first day of each regular session of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof; and full reports of the acts and doings of said government, and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people, shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing for a more permanent government: *Provided*, That no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon or the mining rights therein shall be made: *And provided further*, That no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States, and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interests of the people thereof, and which can not, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.

#### MONROE'S PLAN FOR FLORIDA IN 1822.

Mr. LACEY. Now as to Florida. 't was provided in 1822 under another Democratic Administration:

And be it further enacted, That the legislative power shall be vested in the governor and in thirteen of the most fit and discreet persons in the Territory, to be called the legislative council, who shall be appointed annually by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the citizens of the United States residing there. The governor, by and with the advice and consent of the said legislative council, or a majority of them, shall have power to alter, modify, or repeal the laws which may be in force at the commencement of this act.

Their legislative powers shall also extend to all the rightful subjects of legislation; but no law shall be valid which is inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, or which shall lay any person under restraint, burthen, or disability on account of his religious opinions, professions, or worship; in all which he shall be free to maintain his own, and not burdened with those of another.

It will be observed that in 1822, while the action in regard to Louisiana was still fresh, and while the Democratic party was still in power, they followed the precedent of the Louisiana act by a similar enactment for Florida. It will be observed, further, that in the Louisiana legislation the power of lawmaking was vested in a governor, by and with the consent of a legislative council of fifteen, both the governor and council being appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Bryan would call this imperialism, and so would the gentleman from Tennessee.

When it came to legislation for Florida the legislative power was vested in "a governor and thirteen discreet persons," who should be a legislative council, all appointed by the President. The Florida act almost literally follows the Louisiana act. In later years similar legislation has been enacted, without any objection from our Democratic brethren, for Alaska.

So we have most eminent precedents for the bill that is now denounced as tyranny, precedents from the fathers themselves, going back to Jefferson and Monroe; and that law worked well, and it resulted in giving freedom, it resulted in giving good government, to the people of Louisiana and Florida. And, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with the same proposition now, only in addition to the situation that existed then in Louisiana and in Florida we have actively a war upon our hands in the Philippine Islands, a war in which, I regret to say, our enemies have received much aid and comfort within the limits of the United States of America.

In looking at this morning's dispatches I noticed the arrival of the body of Lieut. John Morrison, jr., a native of the Congressional district which I represent, at San Francisco. He was recently ambushed and murdered in cold blood by the insurgents in Luzon; and yet, Mr. Speaker, one gentleman has arisen on the floor of this House and said that the soldiers under Morrison's command ought to desert, and approved the desertion of those few degenerates who have gone over to the Filipino enemies.

The country was confronted with difficulties on the annexation of Louisiana in many respects like those which now embarrass President McKinley in the Philippines. An alien population, speaking the French and Spanish languages, together with the aboriginal savages, inhabited the territory, and like legislation is proposed to meet analogous circumstances.

#### THE CUBAN SITUATION.

As to Cuba the situation was different. The purpose of this Government was outlined in the resolution by which we intervened in the affairs of that unhappy island. The binding force of that resolution nobody in the United States will now deny, but it does not follow by any means that this country has no rights in Cuba, or power to direct its destiny.



We have spent vast sums of money and sacrificed many valuable lives in securing for Cuba her independence from Spain.

We had, however, another purpose in view in that intervention, which was to abate an insufferable nuisance within 90 miles of our shores. Having, at a cost of millions of dollars and the sacrifice of thousands of lives, freed Cuba from her oppressors, we not only have the right, but it is our duty, to be sure that Spanish tyranny is not followed by anarchy in that island, and the assurances in this bill are both reasonable and moderate. They are in the best interest of Cuba and of ourselves. Let us look at the conditions proposed in the bill:

*Provided further*, That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

## I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain, by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

## II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

## III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

## IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

## V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

## VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

## VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

## VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

These conditions are but simple modifications and adaptations of the Monroe doctrine, applying that doctrine to conditions as they exist at present, as it is our right to do.

I will not detain the House longer at this time. We have a right, both on principle and precedent, to legislate as is proposed in the present bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have these most excellent precedents to which I refer, and which have been followed by the Senate in making the amendment which we are called upon now to ratify and confirm. Of course this class of legislation, this method of government of any country, must be a temporary expedient; permanent government must follow; but these are the necessary preliminaries followed in the past, and will be found successful in the present. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Now, if the gentleman desires to use the balance of his time, I wish he would do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have only one minute.

Mr. DALZELL. I have no applications for time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Speaker, in that minute of course I can not say anything further than I have said in the way of debate. I propose now, however, if the gentleman from Iowa who has just taken his seat will bring forward for the government of the Philippines such a bill as he has charged was passed for the government of the Louisiana territory, we will cease all contention and give him the solid Democratic vote of this side of the House. [Applause.]

We will stop all contention and dispute and further controversy; we will govern the people of the Philippine Islands just as the people of Louisiana were governed by Jefferson. Now, let the gentleman come forward with his proposition, and we will have

peace and harmony here on this subject. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, one would suppose from what has been said on the other side of this Chamber that something out of the ordinary run is sought to be done by the adoption of this rule. That is not so. We simply are adopting the method adopted always by the party of the House responsible for legislation when called upon to finish the public business when it is necessary that it should be done without undue debate.

Why, I recollect the time when, under a Democratic administration of this House, a rule was brought into the House which provided for the introduction of bills aimed at all the great industries of this country, which provided that those bills should be considered without being printed, without being sent to a committee, and considered with only fifteen minutes of debate, and yet here is complaint that we are unduly cutting off debate, when two hours are allowed for the discussion of a subject which has been debated month in and month out during the last three years of our history.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to interrogate the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield? Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Did not the Republicans at that time protest against that kind of procedure?

Mr. DALZELL. Undoubtedly, and protested in vain; and if you would undertake to bring in such a rule now we would protest again. But between that situation and this situation there is no analogy. What is the present situation? We are within four days of adjournment—the compulsory end of the session.

The Army appropriation bill comes over to us carrying two propositions, two main propositions, about which the majority of this House have no doubt, and in the discussion of which gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber have not been at all curtailed.

These propositions in substance have been discussed time and again during not only this Congress but during the preceding Congress. One proposition is that we shall enact into law substantially the Louisiana resolution of 1803. The other is that we shall make such a provision—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Did not the Louisiana resolution to which the gentleman referred by its own terms extend only until Congress should meet again?

Mr. DALZELL. It did.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But this resolution provides otherwise. It provides that it shall continue until Congress directs otherwise, and that will have to meet with the approval of the President; and therefore this resolution continues as long as the President wills that it shall act.

Mr. DALZELL. I will answer the gentleman. This resolution, while it is substantially the Louisiana resolution, is a much more generous resolution than was that, and the provisions of this resolution are much more generous toward the people of the Philippine Islands than was the Louisiana resolution toward the inhabitants of the Louisiana territory.

It is more generous even than was the legislation which succeeded it for the government of the Louisiana territory. Let me read from a historian of repute as to what that government was—a government under the Democratic Administration of Thomas Jefferson. I read from the historian Adams:

It created a Territorial form of government in which the people of Louisiana were to have no share. The governor and secretary were to be appointed by the President for four years. The legislative council, constituted of thirteen members, was to be appointed by the President without consulting the Senate, and was to be convened and prorogued by the governor as he might think proper. The judicial officers, also appointed by the President, were to hold office for four years instead of the usual term of good behavior. \* \* \* The bill—

I continue to quote from this historian, this impartial historian—

It seemed to set the new Territory apart as a peculiar estate, to be governed by the power employed in the right to acquire it.

With the passage of this act and its twin statute for collecting duties in the ceded territory the precedent was complete. Louisiana received a government in which its people, who had been solemnly promised all the rights of American citizens, were set apart, not as citizens, but as subjects, lower in the political scale than the meanest tribe of Indians, whose right to self-government was never questioned. By these measures the Executive and the Legislature recorded their decision in regard to the powers of government over national territory.

There is a Democratic precedent as against your protest of today.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. In the Louisiana act is it not a fact that trial by jury was provided for, and that there was also an express provision that the inhabitants of that territory should have the right to be jurors?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly not. There was no provision of that kind in the original Louisiana act.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me I will read it.



Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman can be heard in his own time. I can not yield now.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I want to read the law. I will state that there is an express provision guaranteeing the right of trial by jury.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I have been all over the question and know what was in the original act, and what was in the Territorial act. There was nothing in the original act as to trial by jury. I have read to you the judgment of the historian Adams as to what was the meaning of the Territorial act, and I will set that up in connection with the provisions embodied in this bill.

I have listened to the gentleman from Missouri repeat here what he repeated on the stump, but the verdict of the people on the stump last November was against him, and the same verdict will continue to be repeated whenever this matter shall be submitted to them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I will read from the act itself, while he has been reading from a commentary.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not yield now. The gentleman knows, and every gentleman knows who will be honest and frank about the matter, that under the instructions given by the President to the Philippine Commission every guaranty of liberty existing under the Constitution of the United States, so far as it is possible to extend that guaranty, has been extended to the citizens of the Philippine Islands.

Now, the other provision here is simply a provision for carrying out the Monroe doctrine in connection with our relations to the island of Cuba and in making proper sanitary provisions, not only for the protection of the people of Cuba, but for the protection of our own people. Upon these two subjects every gentleman in this House has already made up his mind, and it can not be changed by any debate, limited or unlimited.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will my friend yield to me for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. What is the question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman says that this act, as to Cuba, is simply reenacting the Monroe doctrine. Does the gentleman imagine that at this day it is necessary to pass any act in respect to Cuba of that kind?

Mr. DALZELL. It is not a reenactment of the Monroe doctrine. It is simply a declaration as to the pertinence of that doctrine to our relations with Cuba.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman does not think it necessary to pass an act in respect to Cuba of that kind or any South American Republic, does he?

Mr. DALZELL. I think, under the existing circumstances, it is proper and necessary for us to pass this act, so that it may be accepted by the people of the island of Cuba.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAY. A division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 145, nays 127, marked "present" 4, not voting 77, as follows:

## YEAS—145.

Acheson,	Dick,	Joy,	Ray, N. Y.
Adams,	Dovener,	Kahn,	Rodenberg,
Aldrich,	Eddy,	Kerr, Md.	Russell,
Alexander,	Emerson,	Kerr, Ohio	Shattuc,
Allen, Me.	Esch,	Ketcham,	Sherman,
Babcock,	Faris,	Knox,	Showalter,
Bailey, Kans.	Fletcher,	Lacey,	Sibley,
Baker,	Fordney,	Lane,	Smith, Ill.
Barham,	Fowler,	Linney,	Smith, Iowa
Barney,	Freer,	Littauer,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bartholdt,	Gamble,	Long,	Southard,
Bishop,	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager,	Spalding,
Boutell, Ill.	Gardner, N. J.	Lovering,	Sperry,
Bowersock,	Gibson,	Lybrand,	Steele,
Brick,	Gill,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Bromwell,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mann,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brosius,	Graff,	Marsh,	Stewart, Wis.
Brown,	Greene, Mass.	Mercer,	Sulloway,
Brownlow,	Grosvenor,	Miller,	Taylor, Ohio
Burke, S. Dak.	Grow,	Minor,	Thomas, Iowa
Burkett,	Hamilton,	Mondell,	Tompkins,
Butler,	Haugen,	Moody, Mass.	Tongue,
Calderhead,	Hawley,	Moody, Oreg.	Van Voorhis,
Cannon,	Heatwole,	Morris,	Vreeland,
Capron,	Hedge,	Needham,	Wachter,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hemenway,	O'Grady,	Wadsworth,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Conner,	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Waters,
Corliss,	Hill,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Parker, N. J.	Weaver,
Cromer,	Hoffecker,	Payne,	Weeks,
Crumpacker,	Hopkins,	Pearce, Mo.	Weymouth,
Curtis,	Howell,	Pearson,	Wright,
Cushman,	Hull,	Phillips,	Young,
Dahle,	Jack,	Powers,	
Davenport, S. A.	Jenkins,	Prince,	
Davidson,	Jones, Wash.	Pugh,	

## NAYS—127.

Adamson,	Dinsmore,	Lester,	Robb,
Allen, Ky.	Dougherty,	Lewis,	Robinson, Ind.
Allen, Miss.	Driggs,	Little,	Robinson, Nebr.
Atwater,	Driscoll,	Livingston,	Rucker,
Bailey, Tex.	Finley,	Lloyd,	Ruppert,
Ball,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McAleer,	Ryan, N. Y.
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McCall,	Ryan, Pa.
Barber,	Fitzpatrick,	McClellan,	Scudder,
Bell,	Fleming,	McCulloch,	Shafroth,
Bellamy,	Fox,	McDowell,	Sheppard,
Benton,	Gaines,	McLain,	Sims,
Brantley,	Gaston,	McRae,	Slayden,
Breazeale,	Gayle,	May,	Smith, Ky.
Brenner,	Gilbert,	Meekison,	Snodgrass,
Broussard,	Glynn,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Brundidge,	Gordon,	Moon,	Stallings,
Burke, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Muller,	Stark,
Burleson,	Griffith,	Naphen,	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett,	Hall,	Newlands,	Sulzer,
Caldwell,	Hay,	Norton, S. C.	Sutherland,
Carmack,	Henry, Miss.	Otey,	Swanson,
Clayton, Ala.	Henry, Tex.	Pierce, Tenn.	Talbert,
Cochran, Mo.	Jett,	Polk,	Tate,
Cooney,	Johnston,	Quarles,	Terry,
Cooper, Tex.	Jones, Va.	Ransdell,	Thomas, N. C.
Cowherd,	Kitchin,	Rhea, Ky.	Turner,
Cusack,	Kleberg,	Rhea, Va.	Underwood,
Davenport, S. W.	Kluttz,	Richardson, Ala.	Vandiver,
Davey,	Lamb,	Richardson, Tenn.	Williams, J. R.
Davis,	Lanham,	Ridgely,	Williams, Miss.
De Armond,	Latimer,	Riordan,	Zenor.
Denny,	Lentz,	Rixey,	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Boreing,	Meyer, La.	Taylor, Ala.	Thayer.
----------	------------	--------------	---------

## NOT VOTING—77.

Bartlett,	Dayton,	Maddox,	Smith, Samuel W.
Berry,	De Graffenreid,	Mesick,	Sparkman,
Bingham,	Elliott,	Metcalf,	Sprague,
Boutelle, Mo.	Foss,	Morgan,	Stevens, Minn.
Bradley,	Foster,	Morrell,	Stokes,
Brewer,	Gillett, Mass.	Mudd,	Tawney,
Bull,	Graham,	Neville,	Thropp,
Burleigh,	Griggs,	Noonan,	Underhill,
Burton,	Grout,	Norton, Ohio.	Warner,
Campbell,	Howard,	Packer, Pa.	Wheeler,
Catchings,	King,	Pearre,	White,
Chanler,	Landis,	Reeder,	Williams, W. E.
Clark,	Lassiter,	Reeves,	Wilson, Idaho
Clayton, N. Y.	Lawrence,	Roberts,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cooper, Wis.	Levy,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, S. C.
Cox,	Littlefield,	Salmon,	Woods,
Crowley,	Lorimer,	Shackelford,	Ziegler.
Crump,	Loud,	Shelden,	
Cummings,	McCleary,	Small,	
Dalzell,	McDermott,	Smith, H. C.	

So the resolution was adopted.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

On this vote:

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. WOODS with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know whether Mr. FITZPATRICK is recorded as voting. The reason I ask is, I think the Clerk got the response from me for his name.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded.

Mr. FLEMING. I am quite sure that the gentleman is not here, and that they mistook my response for his.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to vote?

Mr. FLEMING. My vote is all right, but I think the Clerk got my response for my name and also for Mr. FITZPATRICK's, as there was some confusion at the time.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order, and desire to be heard briefly upon it. I ask as a preliminary that the Clerk report the first two or three lines of the rule just adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is sufficient. The point of order I make, Mr. Speaker, is that the rule is inoperative, because the bill which this rule, by express words, orders taken from the Speaker's table is not on the Speaker's table, but is in the Committee on Military Affairs. On yesterday, the Chair will remember, when the bill came from the Senate, that unanimous consent was asked to take it up and by unanimous consent agree to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, objection was made. Thereupon, under the rule, the Speaker must refer the bill to the committee to which it belongs, and that is the Committee on Military Affairs. Of course, the Speaker did his duty. No gentleman would presume to say that the Speaker did not do what the rule

provides he shall do. The bill, we conclude, was referred, therefore, to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee is considering it.

This rule does not discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the bill, but the bill is now in that committee and it is now considering it, or it should be, being a bill of so much importance. This being true, the motion to take it from the Speaker's table provided for by this rule must be inoperative. The bill is in the Military Committee, it is not on the Speaker's table; and the motion to take it from the Speaker's table does not discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from its consideration, and therefore this rule just passed is absolutely void and inoperative.

Mr. HULL. Why, Mr. Speaker, that point is too late. It is too late to raise it now.

Mr. DALZELL. Of course it is.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. HULL. It should have been raised when this resolution was introduced.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I could not raise it until now. It is absolutely inoperative, because the bill is not on the Speaker's table.

Mr. HULL. The point comes too late.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The rule calls for the bill to be taken from the Speaker's table, and it is in the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DALZELL. But the bill has never been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not make that defense, as that assumes the Speaker did not do his duty.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read clause 2 of Rule XXIV. The Clerk read as follows:

2. Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows: Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by members; but House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole, may be at once disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House bills already favorably reported by a committee of the House, and not required to be considered in Committee of the Whole, be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will not detain the Chair more than a moment.

This is a bill which, I submit, can not be taken from the Speaker's table except by unanimous consent. Under the rules it requires consideration in Committee of the Whole. Otherwise the gentleman from Iowa need not have asked unanimous consent yesterday to call it up and nonconcur. He could have made a motion to that effect. But the very fact that he made a request to call it up by unanimous consent is a concession that it is a bill which should go to the Committee of the Whole; and I assume, of course, the Speaker did his duty and sent it to the Military Committee.

If it were not a bill which required consideration in the Committee of the Whole it would have been in order to take it from the Speaker's table, or it would have remained on the Speaker's table until laid before the House by the Speaker, and a motion to concur or nonconcur in the Senate amendments would have been in order. But it requires consideration in Committee of the Whole. No one will controvert that. The gentleman from Iowa, as I have said, acted on that assumption. He asked unanimous consent because he could not by motion take it from the Speaker's table for consideration, and I assume the Speaker, under the rule just read, did what the rules required him to do—that is, sent it to the Military Committee.

This morning the House bill making appropriation for the improvement of rivers and harbors came back from the Senate with Senate amendments, which required consideration in the Committee of the Whole just as the amendments to this bill did. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] following correctly the same line of precedents followed by the gentleman from Iowa, rose in his place and asked unanimous consent to take up that bill and nonconcur in the Senate amendments. Unanimous consent was refused. What then did the Speaker do? He sent it to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

So yesterday he must have sent this bill to the Committee on Military Affairs. That able committee, I have no doubt, is at this moment considering this bill, and we can not, by a motion to take it from the Speaker's table, discharge that able committee from its further consideration.

Of course the Chair is familiar with the rule I have already recited. I read from the Digest:

The three requisites for calling up a Senate bill directly from the Speaker's table are that it be not such as to require consideration in the Committee of the Whole, that there be a similar bill on the House Calendar, and that it be called up by authority of a committee.

This bill does require consideration in the Committee of the Whole. No bill like this has been reported by the Military Committee or any other committee before in any legislative body that ever sat on the face of this earth. It is sui generis. Therefore the Speaker must have referred it to the Committee on Military Affairs. And therefore this motion to take it from the Speaker's table must be inoperative.

The SPEAKER. The House is well aware—and the Chair presumes no one more so than the gentleman from Tennessee who submits this point of order—that in the rule which the Chair has had read the language is “may be referred”—not “must be referred.”

Furthermore, every Speaker since the service of the present occupant of the chair began in this House, has exercised a discretion in regard to the matter of making references of bills immediately. This bill, according to the practice for many years—the Chair does not know how long—was not referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and is in fact upon the Speaker's table. If the Speaker erred or departed from the rule in retaining the bill on the table, that error would not do away with the fact that here is the bill upon his table; and that alone destroys the effect of the point of order submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee.

But the Chair believes that in this matter he has simply exercised a discretion which has usually been exercised in this House by occupants of the chair. There is scarcely a member of this House who, when interested in a bill coming from the Senate, as this bill came, has not requested the Chair to hold the bill upon the Speaker's table until it could be disposed of by unanimous consent or otherwise.

It was just as easy to make this special rule applicable to the bill in the Committee of the Whole as on the Speaker's table. It was absolutely within the right of the Committee on Rules to provide for discharging the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of the bill and taking it up in the House for consideration. But the bill was not with that committee.

There is another point to which the Chair desires to invite the attention of the House. No member of this House has lost any rights by reason of the bill remaining upon the Speaker's table. No one is injured. If it had gone to the Committee on Military Affairs the special rule would have been differently drafted.

The Chair must overrule the point of order on two grounds—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be kind enough to allow the Chair to conclude.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I was going to state something that I should have read when on the floor before.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has practically decided this matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Very well; I can read it afterwards.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled; first, because the bill is on the Speaker's table. That being the fact, nothing more need have been said in deciding the point of order. Whatever else the Chair may have said in this ruling was designed to show that he has been acting in the line set by his predecessors and in accordance with the practice of this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the Chair allow me to read three lines?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not in the habit of allowing a matter of that kind after the point has been decided; but if the gentleman insists the Chair will hear him. When a matter has once been decided it is better that we go on with the work of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The Chair said that according to the reading of the rule the Chair “may” refer the bill on the Speaker's table; that the language was “may” and not “shall.” But in the Fifty-first Congress Mr. Speaker Reed decided that—

A House bill with Senate amendments requiring consideration in the Committee of the Whole should be referred from the Speaker's table to the proper standing committee under the rule.

“Should be”—not simply “may be.”

The SPEAKER. That is true as to ultimate action; but nowhere in the rules or the decisions can be found any notation, decision, or ruling saying just when a bill shall be referred. This course is pursued—and the Chair invites the attention of the gentleman—in the interest of the public business, to facilitate and expedite the work of the House. It is the course that has been repeatedly and in fact daily pursued, and the Chair thinks it has been for the good of the public service, no one being damaged.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I very respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DALZELL. I make the point of order that the motion is dilatory. It is purely for the purpose of delay. Gentlemen on the other side have been delaying the proceedings all day.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is not for delay. I have made no dilatory motions.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the appeal be laid on the table.



Mr. GROW. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered.  
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 116,  
answered "present" 3, not voting 87; as follows:

## YEAS—147.

Acheson,	Dalzell,	Jack,	Ray, N. Y.
Adams,	Davenport, S. A.	Jones, Wash.	Roberts,
Aldrich,	Dick,	Kahn,	Rodenberg,
Alexander,	Dovener,	Kerr, Md.	Russell,
Allen, Me.	Driscoll,	Kerr, Ohio	Shattuc,
Babcock,	Eddy,	Ketcham,	Shelden,
Bailey, Kans.	Emerson,	Knox,	Sherman,
Baker,	Esch,	Lacey,	Showalter,
Barham,	Fleming,	Lawrence,	Sibley,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Littauer,	Smith, Ill.
Bartholdt,	Fordney,	Littlefield,	Smith, Iowa
Bishop,	Fowler,	Long,	Smith, H. C.
Boutell, Ill.	Freer,	Loud,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bowersock,	Gambie,	Lovering,	Southard,
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	McCall,	Spalding,
Bromwell,	Gardner, N. J.	Mahon,	Sperry,
Brosius,	Gibson,	Mann,	Steele,
Brown,	Gill,	Marsh,	Stevens, Minn.
Brownlow,	Gillet, N. Y.	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. J.
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff,	Miller,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burkett,	Greene, Mass.	Minor,	Stewart, Wis.
Burleigh,	Grosvenor,	Mondell,	Sulloway,
Butler,	Grout,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Calderhead,	Grow,	Moody, Oreg.	Thropp,
Cannon,	Hamilton,	Morris,	Tompkins,
Capron,	Hawley,	Needham,	Tongue,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Heatwole,	Olmsted,	Van Voorhis,
Connell,	Hedge,	Otjen,	Vreeland,
Conner,	Hemenway,	Overstreet,	Wachter,
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Conn.	Parker, N. J.	Warner,
Corliss,	Hepburn,	Payne,	Waters,
Cousins,	Hill,	Pearce, Mo.	Watson,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Pearson,	Weaver,
Crumpacker,	Hoffecker,	Phillips,	Weeks,
Curtis,	Hopkins,	Powers,	Wright,
Cushman,	Howell,	Prince,	Young,
Dahle,	Hull,	Pugh,	

## NAYS—116.

Adamson,	Finley,	McAleer,	Rucker,
Allen, Ky.	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McClellan,	Ruppert,
Atwater,	Fox,	McCulloch,	Ryan, N. Y.
Bailey, Tex.	Gaines,	McDermott,	Ryan, Pa.
Ball,	Gaston,	McLain,	Salmon,
Bankhead,	Gilbert,	McRae,	Scudder,
Barber,	Gordon,	Maddox,	Shackleford,
Bell,	Green, Pa.	May,	Shafroth,
Bellamy,	Griffith,	Meekison,	Sheppard,
Brantley,	Griggs,	Meyer, La.	Sims,
Breazeale,	Hall,	Miers, Ind.	Slayden,
Brenner,	Hay,	Moon,	Smith, Ky.
Broussard,	Henry, Tex.	Muller,	Snodgrass,
Brundidge,	Jett,	Newlands,	Spight,
Burke, Tex.	Johnston,	Norton, Ohio	Stallings,
Burleson,	Jones, Va.	Norton, S. C.	Stark,
Burnett,	King,	Otey,	Stephens, Tex.
Carmack,	Kitchin,	Pierce, Tenn.	Sulzer,
Clayton, Ala.	Kleberg,	Polk,	Swanson,
Cochran, Mo.	Kluttz,	Quarles,	Talbert,
Cooney,	Lamb,	Ransdell,	Tate,
Cooper, Tex.	Lanham,	Rhea, Ky.	Taylor, Ala.
Cusack,	Latimer,	Richardson, Ala.	Terry,
Davenport, S. W.	Lentz,	Richardson, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Davis,	Lester,	Ridgely,	Vandiver,
De Armond,	Lewis,	Riordan,	Williams, J. R.
Dinsmore,	Little,	Rixey,	Williams, Miss.
Dougherty,	Livingston,	Robb,	Zenor,
Driggs,	Lloyd,	Robinson, Ind.	Ziegler,

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Glynn,	Landis,	Thayer.
--------	---------	---------

## NOT VOTING—87.

Allen, Miss.	Davey,	Linney,	Small,
Bartlett,	Davidson,	Lorimer,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Benton,	Dayton,	Loudenslager,	Sparkman,
Berry,	De Graffenreid,	Lybrand,	Sprague,
Bingham,	Denny,	McCleary,	Stokes,
Boring,	Elliott,	McDowell,	Sutherland,
Boutelle, Me.	Faris,	Mercer,	Tawney,
Bradley,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Mesick,	Taylor, Ohio
Brewer,	Fitzpatrick,	Morgan,	Turner,
Bull,	Foss,	Morrell,	Underhill,
Burton,	Foster,	Mudd,	Underwood,
Caldwell,	Gayle,	Napfen,	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Gillett, Mass.	Neville,	Wanger,
Catchings,	Graham,	Noonan,	Weymouth,
Chanler,	Haugen,	O'Grady,	Wheeler,
Clark,	Henry, Miss.	Packer, Pa.	White,
Clayton, N. Y.	Howard,	Pearre,	Williams, W. E.
Cowherd,	Jenkins,	Reeder,	Wilson, Idaho.
Cox,	Joy,	Reeves,	Wilson, N. Y.
Crowley,	Lane,	Rhea, Va.	Wilson, S. C.
Crum,	Lassiter,	Robertson, La.	Woods,
Cummings,	Levy,	Robinson, Nebr.	

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. BLUL with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. WILSON of New York.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

Mr. FARIS with Mr. DENNY.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. TURNER.

Mr. JOY with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. SMALL.

For the balance of the day:

Mr. WOODS with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. LANE with Mr. McDOWELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments in gross.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments in gross, and the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one hour and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HULL. Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, with the debate on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that general leave to print be given for five days to all members of the House, their remarks to be confined to the subject embraced in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general leave to print on the bill be given for five days, the speeches to be confined to the discussion of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. To that, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SULZER. I trust, Mr. Speaker, there will be no objection to that request. There are many gentlemen who want to speak on the bill and can not get time.

Mr. HULL. I do not yield anything out of my time.

The SPEAKER. The right to object is absolute in any member, and the objection is not withdrawn.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House dealt only with the Army and the pay of the Army for the next fiscal year. The Senate has taken it as a vehicle for legislation outside of these purposes and has made amendments to the Army bill proper which, if there had been an opportunity, would have been probably objected to by some of the members of the committee. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing on the bill, so far as the pay of the Army or the government of the Army is concerned, which will materially affect the organization of the Army and which could not be remedied at our next session of Congress. We have but two days more for legislative work, and everyone realizes the importance of getting the great appropriation bills through, and the Committee on Military Affairs, or a majority of it at least, thoroughly indorsed the proposition to pass the bill without sending it to conference. The main change in the bill, so far as organization of the Army is concerned, is with regard to the staff corps, and they are opened up to the line of the Army, so that a man who is serving in the line heretofore is eligible to an appointment in the staff. Outside of that one proposition there is nothing in the bill that need give us any concern. Many members of the House believe that it is wise to enlarge the number of persons eligible to staff positions.

Mr. HAY. What does the gentleman understand to be the age limit as to these staff appointments from the line?

Mr. HULL. There is no age limit—

Mr. HAY. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. HULL. Except as to chaplains. As to those we increased the age limit two years.

I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, there would have been no controversy over this bill in the House but for the radical amendments placed on it in the Senate affecting Cuba and the Philippine Islands. For that reason I do not desire to occupy any great amount of time in discussion unless some one desires to ask a question in regard to the Army bill proper. So far as those two amendments are concerned, there is no member of the House who has not been giving attention to every provision incorporated in the bill from the time they were introduced in the Senate down to the present time.

There is no doubt that if we had a month in place of two days they would not have been inserted in this bill. It is putting them here or having an extra session of Congress. So far as I am concerned personally, I believe the provision as to Cuba conservative and exceedingly wise. So far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, the provision is more a limitation upon the power of the President than it is an enlargement of his power.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee has told us that the two great provisions of this bill, which have come to it by way of amendment attached to it in the Senate, are in derogation of the principles of the American Republic and opposed to the traditions of the Democratic party. He has gone

beyond that and stated, in effect, that these were provisions destroying the whole theory of liberty in the islands and wresting from those people the degree of liberty which he says is traditional with the American character. He used language which in substance and in effect charged that the whole history and policy of the Democratic party had been opposed to securing from other people territory or land or dominion without the consent and advice and willingness of those who were thereby acquired. He spoke of it as the hereditary policy of the present Democratic party. I do not quote his language, but I do him justice in this comment. Let us see how the matter stands. Let us see what has been the traditional policy of the Democratic party.

In 1854 the Democratic party was in full power in the United States; its authority in every branch of administration was uncontested and unquestioned. At that time the Democratic President called to his aid, by a secret letter of instructions sent to them by special messenger, unrecorded in the Department of State, a secret and clandestine message directing James Buchanan, minister to England; John Y. Mason, minister to France; and Pierre Soulé, minister to Spain, to assemble at Ostend, in the Kingdom of Prussia, and decide what ought to be done in regard to Cuba. Spain at that time was at peace with the United States. In no way had she trespassed upon our rights. There was perfect peace in the island of Cuba. There were no complaints that the Cuban people were being trampled under foot. The cry of "Cuba libre" had never yet been raised in this country. These three emissaries of annexation, these three emissaries of rapine and seizure, acting under secret authority, assembled at Ostend, met afterwards at Aix-la-Chapelle, and issued a proclamation, called the Ostend manifesto. They, in the first place, proposed to offer to Spain \$100,000,000 for the island of Cuba. They did not have the money—Democratic Administrations seldom do—and the whole Democratic party and the Administration did not have that amount of money; but they proposed to get it in some way. Later on they proposed that \$120,000,000 should be given; and then this is a part of the Ostend manifesto: "Does Cuba in the possession of Spain seriously endanger our internal peace?"—not our external peace—and this question answered in the affirmative, they said:

Then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting Cuba from Spain if we possess the power, and it is upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor if there was no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own house.

That was the deliberate secret act of the Democratic Administration, and was approved two years later by the nomination of the chairman of that commission at Ostend for President of the United States upon the Democratic platform, and indorsing in effect and in substance the Ostend manifesto thereby. That is one of the traditions of the Democratic party, and another is to vote to repudiate a tradition for a political purpose.

Mr. CARMACK rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would prefer to be permitted to continue my speech; but I do not want to be uncourteous.

Mr. CARMACK. Do you indorse the proposition of the Ostend manifesto?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, I do not; but it has never been repudiated by the Democratic party.

Mr. CARMACK. It has been repudiated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is wholly mistaken. It had been the settled policy of his party to seize Cuba until slavery had been abolished. The gentleman from Tennessee says if you will bring in a bill like the Louisiana bill he and all his side of the House will vote for it.

Now, see how a man does when he wants to bluff somebody upon a very small organization in his own hand. If you will bring in a bill "like the Louisiana purchase," then we will have peace and harmony and all vote for it! There is a difference between the two conditions. In the case of the Louisiana purchase we had not possession of it; and the second difference between the two conditions is that one came by purchase from France by peaceful measures, and this comes by treaty from Spain at the close of war and as the result of conquest. The gentleman from Tennessee knows that on our acquisition of Florida, which we have discussed here so often and which had undergone no softening-down process, is a very different question from those now confronting us. There does seem to have been a softening process at the other end of the Capitol in this particular instance. There was in the Florida case no deliberate consideration of what also we know of the glamor of collateral or incidental questions that seems to have been looming up in the rear of the more recent step of the Democratic party, and in that particular instance regardless of anybody. Hardly knowing who the people were we had acquired in Florida, we sent an army under the direction of Mon-

roe to seize the people and take possession, and have ever since governed them according to the Constitution and laws of the United States as we applied them.

What else? Throughout the whole history of this country we have done nothing to denounce or deny the justice and legality of our acts. Take all the traditions of our country and there is not a single instance of a repudiation of that history. If this debate is to be of value, let me suggest to somebody that he tell me where we acquired a foot of territory that we have treated differently from the manner we are treating the Philippines to-day. When did we send to Alaska to inquire what the people over there wanted us to do? When we discovered the territory of Oregon, when we acquired territory at the close of the Mexican war, whenever in the whole history of our country have we taken one step that we have not taken in the case of the Philippine Islands? The whole of this is a mere appeal to a sentiment that does not exist in this country; and I want to say to our friends on the other side these appeals in the name of liberty, these appeals in the name of the consent of the governed, sounded well in the balmy days of last summer; they came with mellifluous utterance from the leader of the Democratic party, and were feebly imitated on every stump and in every newspaper by his supporters.

These songs were sung with great exultation, and while you were doing this we were looking up our traditions, representing our history, and understanding the organization of this mighty empire. We took for our candidate the man who more fully represented the very opposite of all claimed by the Democrats in the arguments in their campaign and gave him a majority for the Presidency of the United States without precedent in the history of the country, and we put such a majority against Mr. Bryan as testified to the popular view of the American people. [Applause.] That was the decision of the people, and the position of the gentleman from Tennessee was left by that great popular verdict and judgment in the graveyard of your defeat last fall. I beg you to leave your dead in undisturbed slumber.

For fear my time may be exhausted, I want to come to another matter. There seems to be mistrust that some wrong is to be done somewhere, by somebody, name and locality unknown. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything wrong about this bill, about its presence here, about the support the Republican party and the Administration and the Senate are giving to these measures now pending on this bill in the House, I know nothing about it, and I do not understand that anybody complains about that. These are our principles, and we stand upon our historical traditions. There seems to be something the matter with Democratic gentlemen and with the Democracy generally with regard to this matter. Whoever heard here in the history of the American Congress the like of what I am going to read to you?

We have heard language here within the last half hour more astonishing to me than any language I have heard in this Hall during the long period which I have had the honor to be a member of Congress. I have heard in very general terms complaints made about other public men outside of this body and inside of this body, but I never before heard an organized, deliberate arraignment of the Senate of the United States or of any member of it upon this floor before. The rules of the House of Representatives, the rules of Jefferson's Manual, the rules that must be the rules of all parliamentary bodies to insure respect and consideration for the views and opinions of others, have not served to stay the tide of wrath which poured itself out of the inimitable sarcasm and bitterness of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]. Was it justified? Is it justified? I know not; I care not. It is enough for me, Mr. Speaker, to know that great good has come of whatever acts the members of the other House have been guilty of.

I read from a speech made a few moments ago by the distinguished and able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]:

There is thrust into this Chamber now by the tyranny of the majority—

That is us; we are the fellows—

by the connivance of others who had power and did not use it, a question which can not be considered here, but which is to be settled here. In the closing hours of this session the body which could have prevented, the men who could have barred from this Chamber these great questions, for reasons of their own which I have not time to bring to light—

I wish the gentleman had time to bring it to light—

and upon which I do not care now to enter, for reasons of their own, yielding to inducements—

What inducements did the gentleman refer to? Will he tell us? sufficiently powerful to them and with them, have allowed this measure to come with these amendments to this House.

To what people did the gentleman refer? Who are the people thus corrupted by reason of inducements sufficiently powerful? Who are they? There seems to be some light thrown on that later on:

If I had the time I would be glad to discuss this infamous measure. I would be glad to discuss this infamous procedure, the infamous surrender, the infamous cowardice, the infamous trading and trafficking, the infamous surrender, the infamous disregard of everything sacred and holy and decent and honorable and glorious in these United States of America.

Who did that? Not the Republicans of the Senate. Surely not.



Not the President and his Cabinet, surely not, for we are standing upon the very platform of this resolution. Who has done this infamous act?

I commend to the tyrants here—

That is our side—

I commend to the sycophants and the traders and the traffickers elsewhere the plunder that they get.

What did they get, in the name of the Benevolent Father of all? [Laughter.] What did they get? Will my friend from Missouri make a public statement that the sycophants whom he has pointed out with sufficient accuracy, so that everybody knows who he means, will he kindly tell us what they got? What was the inducement? It goes directly to the charge and commends to them the plunder, the loot, the bribes, which they have got; and I can give to the language no other meaning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAPRON. I will yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COONEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If it is very short.

Mr. COONEY. I understand the gentleman from Missouri, to whom the gentleman from Ohio refers, is not here; but in his behalf I will ask the gentleman if he will procure him sufficient time in the consideration of this bill to answer his charge?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, the gentleman has an hour on that side, and I am not making a charge. I am reading the language of the gentleman, and he will not deny the meaning. So, Mr. Speaker, I think our friends on the other side are a little bit worried that we are bringing out of chaos, with the aid possibly of some auxiliary conditions—that is a good word for it [laughter]—we are bringing out of the body of men who have been attempting to hold this Government to conditions that would be intolerable up to conditions that in my judgment meet the demands of the patriotism of the people of the United States. [Applause.] Let us see what we have done. We have driven Spain out of Cuba. Peace has been restored, whether good order has or not. A stable government has not been established and can not be during the life of this Congress; but the material interests of that people have been improved to such an extent that in my judgment the blessings of the people of the island of Cuba are constantly heaped up on the name of the American Republic. [Applause.]

What have we done in Porto Rico? There you suffered so very greatly over the sorrows of that people. You really thought there was going to be some trouble in Porto Rico. You said we were taxing them unreasonably; you talked about the Constitution and the flag; you said we were seizing upon the little 15 per cent that we placed as a tax upon their products in their own interest. What has come of that during this one brief year that has rolled over your heads and which has thrown light upon your prophetic utterance? They have had a free government; they have established legislative authority; they have met and considered the conditions; they have adjourned while the burdensome Porto Rican tariff is still in full force. By a single resolution they might have lifted the 15 per cent off of their imports and effected the repeal of the law that gave us so much trouble here a little over a year ago. They adjourned without any action in that direction, thereby writing their indorsement on the action of the Republican party, and to-day the people of Porto Rico are the happiest, the best educated, the best clothed, the best fed and with better prospects ahead of them than ever appertained to the inhabitants of any of the islands in the Caribbean Sea. [Applause on Republican side.]

Prophets of evil, pessimists, and croakers join technical lawyers and disappointed politicians grumbling and growling over the sad fate that has indicated the estimate the American people place upon them over the situation in Porto Rico, and the outcry went from ocean to ocean that the poor people of that island had been downtrodden under foot by the Republican Administration. Sage men rushed into print to prate about the consent of the governed, and the doctrine of *ex proprio vigore* was rolled as a sweet morsel upon the tongues of men, all drifting toward a Presidential election in 1900. Men who ought to have taken a different stand threw little barbed arrows of sarcasm and doubt upon the legality of the Porto Rican legislation, and have spoken of the people down there as under the oppressive force of our tyranny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at the map of the world and its history combined, I challenge any living man to show where a people transformed and transferred by a treaty, whether made in pursuance of conquest of war or purchase or annexation or what not, has ever under any circumstances been treated with the liberality and generosity that have the people of the island of Porto Rico; and they feel it and they know it, and the genius of American institutions extended to them by the hands of William McKinley, the Republican President of the United States, backed up by the sincere Republicans of this House and of the Senate and supported by the great moral influence of the intelligent people

of the United States, has done all this and set an example to all the world of what the American Republic can do under conditions like these. Where stands the pessimist to-day? Where stands the croaker? Where stands the man who predicted all sorts of evil? Wrapped up in the mantle of their own self-estimate, refuted by the facts and figures of the beautiful demonstration in Porto Rico.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSVENOR. My time is very short.

Mr. CARMACK. I only want to ask a question. Suppose the people of Cuba should refuse to submit to these limitations on their independence provided in the Spooner amendment. What is this Government to do?

Mr. GROSVENOR. We have thus far, Mr. Speaker, been able to cross the bridges when we came to them, without the aid of gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. CARMACK. You are at the bridge now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is no time to talk about what we will do if—

Mr. CARMACK. That is because you will not give us time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." The question is, What shall we do to-day? To-day we put forth the ultimatum to the people of Cuba, not one branch of which will be held by the American people, by civilized people of the world, or, in my judgment, by the people of Cuba to be onerous or unjust to them.

Mr. CARMACK. The gentleman says "an ultimatum."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I used the word "ultimatum" with absolute accuracy of understanding and meaning. The people of this country understand what it is. The people of this country will be proud of the party that will uphold the dignity and authority of the American people in the island of Cuba until the conditions are reached which will justify us, in the light of our pledges and in the light of the deliberate judgment of mankind, to withdraw our military operations and occupation and turn over to the people of Cuba their own island to their own government.

I used the word "ultimatum" as referring to the present. It is the ultimatum of the American people to-day. It is what we are willing to adjourn with having enacted. We are willing to turn over the question now to the action of the people of Cuba, and the future will take care of itself. No act of injustice has been done to the people of Cuba; no act of wrong or seizure of their rights; no intervention as against the best interests of Cuba, and everybody in the world knows it. We have fortified their harbors, we have subjected and eliminated their most fatal disease, we have put in motion the wheels of commerce, we have stimulated enterprise, we have suppressed insurrection, we have eradicated the evil conditions that have existed in that island for so long, and the success that we have had has been wonderful in view of the fact that we have a party in this country willing to block the wheels and impede the onward progress of the country.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, about the Filipinos.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will leave the Filipino question to somebody else. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS].

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the importance of these amendments and would not trespass upon the time of the House if I were in full accord with the spirit and letter of both amendments. I am in hearty accord with the amendment with reference to the Philippine Islands, because it assures to the people of those islands the rights, protection, and liberty that always go with the American flag. We can safely trust the President with the government of these islands until they have become entirely pacified and their people taught to recognize and appreciate the blessings of American sovereignty.

I am constrained to vote for the amendment with reference to the island of Cuba, because I believe that the adoption thereof will insure the continuance of our sovereignty. I am unalterably opposed to the surrender of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Cuba. We intervened in the cause of humanity, and humanity, in my judgment, demands the maintenance of our flag in order to insure to the people of Cuba future peace, prosperity, and happiness. Their future depends upon our action. Remove from the island of Cuba the protection of the Stars and Stripes, and riots, civil strife, and revolution will follow. General Gomez expressed the dangers in store for the Cuban people when he declared that in the present condition of the island, should our flag be removed, he would go with it.

I hold in my hand public resolution No. 21 (Teller resolution), in which we declared that the people of Cuba are, and by right ought to be, free and independent. I voted for that resolution, and intended thereby to extend to them the same liberty, freedom, and independence enjoyed by the citizens of our own territory.



What greater liberty and independence can be obtained than that enjoyed under the protection of our flag? All fair-minded men, familiar with the conditions of Cuba, recognize their inability to maintain peace and independence without the protection of our country. We should guard and protect not only the people of Cuba but our own citizens and their interests on the island. I hope and expect that the adoption of the present amendment may continue our sovereignty and induce the people of Cuba to voluntarily ask for the annexation of Cuba, and thereby extend the blessings of humanity for which our country intervened.

I do not forget the humiliation of the American people when a Democratic President hauled down our flag in the islands of Hawaii. Our citizens universally condemned that act, and I rejoice that with the cooperation of the people of those islands our flag has again been raised and our sovereignty perpetually established for the future glory of the Pacific. I would not again humiliate our people, endanger the peace and happiness of the Cubans, disturb our peaceful relations, or render it possible for a second intervention, which would certainly be necessary to insure peace, happiness, and prosperity to the people of Cuba with the removal of our flag.

Mr. HULL. I suggest now that my friends on the other side use a part of their time.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. James R. Williams].

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor] would consume as much time in defending Republicans who need defense as he wastes on Democrats, his remarks would be far more interesting and he would come more nearly earning his salary as a member of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He seldom takes the floor that he does not have something to say as to what Jefferson did. Now, if he would only devote a little of his time to defending the great national boss of his own party, who seems to have control of this Administration, or the worst part of it, at least, his remarks would receive the greatest attention.

No one regrets more than myself that this very dangerous proposition for the government of the Philippines should come before this House in the closing hours of its session and at a time when it is impossible for it to receive that consideration which its importance demands. And I can not accept the apology for its being sent here at this late hour, that the President is already exercising in the Philippines the power granted in the proposed amendment. I deny it. The power now used by the President in the Philippines is executive and military power, while the power given him by this amendment is legislative and judicial power. Here is the language of the amendment:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

By this amendment the President is given absolute power in the Philippines; not only executive, but legislative and judicial as well. This is one-man power, pure and simple. The President is made the complete master of the Filipinos unrestrained by Congress, the Constitution, or anything else. This is imperialism run mad. The Constitution provides that all legislative power under our Government shall be vested in Congress. Then what right have we to turn this power over to the President?

But then we are no longer proceeding under the Constitution. Every gentleman on the other side who has attempted to defend the despotism in this amendment has cited as a precedent for this action the law under which Jefferson governed the Louisiana Territory. In order that the repeated misrepresentations of these gentlemen may be understood by the House and the country I here give the law under which Jefferson then acted, and so often referred to by members on the other side of the Chamber.

Until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said Territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

You will observe that this law was intended for temporary government only, and by its own terms was to expire with that session of Congress. You will further notice that the officers appointed by Jefferson were to exercise the same powers as was then being exercised by the officers of the existing (French) government in the territory; while under the pending amendment Mr. McKinley's appointees are authorized to enact new laws and establish a new government, and not to merely carry on the one already existing.

Besides, the treaty under Jefferson provided the inhabitants of the new territory should be citizens of the United States, and Jefferson governed them as citizens and in accordance with the

Constitution, while McKinley is authorized to govern the Filipinos as subjects and in violation of the Constitution. The legislative council under Jefferson were required to be inhabitants of the territory and could pass no law in violation of the Constitution of the United States, while under this amendment for the Philippines the legislative assembly are not required to be inhabitants of the island and are not bound by the Constitution. In fact an amendment offered in the Senate requiring these new officers to take an oath to support the Constitution was voted down by the Republicans, Senator Hoar being the only Republican who supported it. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me no just President could desire such despotic power over any people, and the man who would seek it is a dangerous person to be intrusted with it.

Think what a wretched and helpless condition you place those Filipinos in when you authorize the President to establish over them, without restraint, a carpet-bag government, composed, in part, at least, of Neelys and other plunderers who will go there to enrich themselves and rob the people whom they are sent to govern. It will not only result in corruption there as in Cuba, but will breed corruption at home also.

No, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson never attempted to exercise any such despotism as this. What king wields a greater power over his subjects than that given to the President by this amendment? How fast is the President of the United States becoming the Government of the United States. What member of this House would rise in his place and say that the President of the United States does not to-day control both branches of Congress on all important political legislation?

By the shrewd use of his great patronage he is able to influence not only his own party in both branches of Congress, but often a good per cent of his opponents, and so successful has been the present Executive in his assumed legislative functions that it is now intimated that he is even venturing upon the Supreme Court of the United States. Surely the time has come when the people should take warning at this increasing power of the President.

I care not how able or honest he may be, no one man is safe to intrust with all the rights and liberties of a people. As I said on a former occasion, I am opposed to retaining the Philippines under any form of government, but so long as we do attempt to control them we should endeavor to govern them in accordance with our Constitution and form of government. I repeat that no one man is good enough to govern another just as he pleases and without any restraint whatever; and yet this is just what the President is authorized to do by this amendment.

Is it possible that Congress can have so little regard for its own acts as to pass a measure of this importance without any consideration either in committee or by the House? If so, it only shows what a revolution is going on in our form of government, and apparently with the approval of the people. Indeed this is the day of imperialism in America, but I hope late in the evening. I trust the morning of liberty will again soon dawn upon the American people, and they will return to the ways of the Constitution our fathers gave us.

A few words only with reference to the Cuban amendment, which attempts to give the United States control over the domestic as well as the foreign affairs of the island. If we adopt this amendment we openly violate our sacred pledge to Cuba, in which we declared the Cubans were, and of right ought to be, free; that we were intervening for the independence of Cuba, and would withdraw from the island whenever peace was established. If we pass this amendment against Cuba we advertise to the rest of the world what supreme hypocrites are in control at Washington. I would rejoice to see Cuba peacefully annexed to the United States, but I am not willing to steal it.

If this Administration had treated Porto Rico with that justice and fairness to which she was entitled, Cuba to-day would have been standing with outstretched hands appealing to the United States for annexation. But is it strange that our cruel and selfish treatment of Porto Rico should cause Cuba to look with some suspicion upon our pretended friendship? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor] said at one time some Democratic Administration had attempted to buy Cuba. If he is correct in that statement it only shows the difference between that Democratic Administration and the present one is the Democrats attempted to buy Cuba while the Republicans are attempting to steal it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe the parties in control of this Administration are just as anxious for the good things in Cuba as in the Philippines, and every effort will be made to provoke Cuba into war in order that the Administration may have an excuse to take possession of the island for these greedy beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks I wish to submit a few observations on the subject of appropriations. This bill now under consideration appropriates for the Army for the next fiscal year \$115,735,644.10, while the amount appropriated for our Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, was only \$23,129,844.30.

This is the swift and bitter fruit of imperialism. It costs the



people five times as much to maintain our army now as it did three years ago. At this rate it will cost a county of 25,000 people about \$40,000 per year to help maintain our standing army. And all this increase not for the benefit of the taxpayers, but to enrich those greedy speculators who want to hold on to those foreign islands. And this new policy of imperialism has greatly increased our expenses in other directions.

The appropriations for the Navy this year are over \$78,000,000, an increase of forty-five millions over 1898. The total appropriations for the next fiscal year just completed by this Congress are over \$729,000,000, which does not include anything for rivers and harbors or public buildings, while the total appropriations for 1898 were less than five hundred and twenty-nine millions. That is, it will cost the people over \$200,000,000 more to run the Government next year than it did in 1898.

To conduct this Government with its present extravagance one year costs every man, woman, and child about \$10 apiece, or a family of five \$50, or a county of 25,000 \$250,000. If the people quietly submit to this increasing extravagance in the use of public money it will not be long until every laboring man must pay one-half his earnings to maintain a large standing army and navy and other increasing expenses of the Government.

How can the people hope for any substantial reduction in taxes unless they call a halt on Congress in these extravagant expenditures? This rapid increase in the expenses of our Government is due almost entirely to this new policy of foreign conquest and imperialism. And in order that the President may have plenty of money to spend away from home on these vicious schemes, the people at home are deprived of the necessary public funds to repair their rivers and harbors, erect public buildings, and for other purposes. In fact, the old soldier, who fought for liberty and Union, is often denied his just pension in order that the money may be used on a large standing army to carry on a war of conquest in a foreign land.

It is to be hoped that our people will soon grow tired of wasting so much blood and treasure in foreign islands in which they have no interest and from which no good to them can ever come. Why not spend our lives and our money in trying to make our own people prosperous and happy, instead of wasting them on foreign races? Why should not America be satisfied with America, where, with good government and proper conditions, every citizen may become prosperous and happy under his own vine and fig tree? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE].

[Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition, if I was able physically to do it, to make a speech. The speaking ought to take place at the other end of the Capitol. I think they ought to have spoken there until December had rolled around again before this thing should have ever been passed. Just one suggestion. I have voted from the commencement of this Philippine question against what is going on. I voted against the war, without saying to those people what you were shooting them for and giving them an opportunity to adopt for themselves a government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Let me complete this sentence.

Mr. SULZER. I will yield to the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. COX. You have got in this legislation a declaration that the United States owns territory where the Constitution can not extend. You have got in this legislation another proposition, and that is that the power of one man can take the life of a man or he can take his liberty from him without trial by jury. You have got another thing. Against every rule of policy, against the genius of our Government, and against every true principle that has ever been taught of respect and honor for the law of legislation, you insert it at the end of an appropriation bill.

Mr. SULZER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

[Mr. McDERMOTT addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL. In connection with that, I ask that all others who speak on this bill, at least, shall have the same privilege for a period of five days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen speaking on this bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five days. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. If they are confined to the bill, I will not object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. With the condition requiring them to be confined to the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SULZER. In connection with what the gentleman from Iowa has said, there are a number of gentlemen on this side of the House who have asked me to make the request for unanimous consent for general leave to print on this bill for five days. I trust there will be no objection to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that there be general leave to print on this bill for five days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object.

Mr. SULZER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, in the name of the American people—in the name of consistency and justice and truth—I want to protest against the resolutions in reference to Cuba inserted by the Senate as an amendment to this Army bill, and which we are called upon now to concur in. I protest against them because they violate our expressed promise, and because they are inconsistent with our national honor. Before we went to war with Spain, and as a preliminary thereto, we openly, frankly, and plainly declared our purpose. That purpose we fully and unequivocally stated in the following solemn resolution:

[PUBLIC RESOLUTION—No. 2.]

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can no longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore

Resolved, etc., First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States, the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Approved April 20, 1898.

No one will contend that there is any ambiguity in the language of this declaration. No one will undertake to point out a single word of doubtful meaning. When we said "that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent," we but quoted from our own blessed Declaration of Independence the words that have thrilled the hearts of freemen for more than a hundred years.

The fathers who framed that immortal Declaration said "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." And so when Congress, on the 20th of April, 1898, wanted to express the full and complete idea in reference to Cuba's struggle to rid herself of the galling yoke of Spanish tyranny, we employed the words so well known and so dear to every American heart. Following these resolutions, and to carry out the spirit and purpose there set forth, we declared war against Spain. Columbia's sons from North and South and East and West rallied to arms in the cause of liberty.

Our victories were speedy, startling, and complete. Castile was vanquished and Cuba was "free"—so we proclaimed. Before taking up arms we solemnly declared "that the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

An archipelago in the Orient and islands in the Atlantic were ceded to us in the treaty of peace, but not Cuba. Spain agreed to quit that island, as we had demanded she should, and we made no pretense of right to occupy it with our Army except for the "pacification" of its people and to see that "a stable government" was formed. More than two years have passed since then, and during all the weeks and months that have intervened the Cuban people have been submissive and peaceful.

No riotous disposition has been manifested and no disturbances



have occurred. So soon as we gave them opportunity, their delegates assembled in peaceful convention to frame their organic law. That instrument is now, I believe, here in Washington. It ought to be submitted to Congress before we adjourn.

We know that it provides for a republic and contains all the essentials of a government by and for the people. But though that constitution is now probably in the hands of the Administration it will not be submitted to us, and now in the closing days of this Congress, while we are rushing through this Army bill, the managers for the dominant party offer, as a rider upon the bill, the resolutions against which I am protesting. They are engrafted upon it as it comes back to us from the Senate. That they will be accepted in this House no one who is familiar with the spirit of the times can for a moment doubt. Here they are, and in the name of justice, I protest against them:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

## I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

## II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

## III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

## IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

## V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

## VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

## VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

## VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we are complacently told by gentlemen who favor these resolutions that they are exceedingly mild and are merely "suggestive" to the Cuban people of a few things we have the right to expect from them. Let us see. We are about to say to them that they will not be permitted to make treaties with other countries which will impair or tend to impair their independence, and we are to be the judges of the tendency of all proposed treaties.

We are about to say to them that they can not go into debt beyond such limit as we may regard as safe for them. We are about to prescribe a restriction for them which the Federal Government has never yet undertaken to prescribe for any one of the States of the American Union. Let me read again:

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

We are about to say to them that their health laws must be made to suit us before we will remove our soldiers from their midst. And yet here at home we regard the right to make laws for the preservation of the public health as one of the reserved rights of the States. We would not think of sending an armed force into one of the States of this Union because, forsooth, its health laws or its sanitary condition might not be up to an approved standard. "That is all true," said a gentleman in discussing this matter with me the other day, "but circumstances alter cases; it is different, you know, when it comes to Cuba."

Mr. Speaker, it is not different "when it comes to Cuba." Principle should control us, and not expediency. We should give the

people of that devoted but hapless isle at least a fair opportunity to voluntarily and gracefully show their gratitude to us. I believe the true and real Cuban is grateful to us. I doubt much whether that class of so-called "business men" on the island who sympathized with Spain during the Cuban war and who sympathize with Spain to this good day are grateful to us.

I doubt whether the money-making classes of Habana and Santiago—those gentlemen who meet at city clubs to discuss political ethics and who offer us much voluntary advice with many insinuating suggestions to the effect that the native Cuban is not capacitated for self-government—I doubt, I say, whether we should give much heed to them. They are not the class for whom we struck the blow at Spain; they are not the patriots we had in mind when we declared war; they care nothing for liberty; they care alone for the almighty dollar.

"The people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent." We have said it, and let us stand to it. Let us not be persuaded by the advice of those who now argue that we ought never to have made these promises. Let us be just, as we have been generous; as noble as we are brave. Addressing this House the other day on the subject of our treaty obligations, I said what I now wish to repeat in this connection.

Are obligations resting upon the people in their collective capacity as binding as when entered into by the individual? For one, I believe they are. For one, I am anxious to see my country as prompt and scrupulous in keeping its obligations as I should expect an honest man to be in keeping his.

There on the wall of this Chamber, standing side by side with Washington, is the portrait of Lafayette. Facing the Executive Mansion in this city is a bronze statue of this illustrious friend of our Republic, and I feel like raising my hat whenever I pass it. He came to aid our struggling colonies in the darkening days of the American Revolution, when hope had almost ceased to lighten the pathway of our patriotic fathers. By his aid and the aid of his countrymen defeat was turned into victory and our independence was established. I point to his example and to the example of his country.

France did not assume, because she had been our benefactor, to become our dictator, nor did she presume to prescribe conditions upon which she would recall her soldiers from our soil. I commend now that shining example to this House, to the Executive of this Government, and to my countrymen. If Cuba, by reason of turbulence or bad sanitary laws or improper treaties, shall ever hereafter menace this country, we can deal with her in some proper and timely way. Let us at least wait for some such justification.

Mr. SULZER. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not vain enough to suppose for a moment that anything I can say will have any influence whatever upon the vote we are soon to take upon the pending measure. Indeed, if that were the only consideration I should not trespass upon the time of the House at all, but representing on this floor, as I do, a district, and in part a State, which extends nearer to the island of Cuba than any other, whose people are more deeply interested in the relations which we are to sustain to that island and to the Cuban people than those of any other section of the country, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty should I not enter my feeble protest against the action we are to take here to-day.

We are about to perpetrate, in my judgment, a great wrong, not only upon the Cubans but upon our own people as well. We are about to cast a blot and a stain upon our fair name and do a wrong to civilization which all the centuries will not wipe out or efface.

A little less than three years ago, beneath the Dome of this Capitol, and on a memorable occasion, we solemnly declared that Cuba ought to be free and independent. We were then about to engage in a war with Spain, ostensibly for the benefit of the Cubans. They had not asked us to take this action or to intervene in their behalf at the risk of war. Indeed, through their leaders they had made it known to the President and the members of Congress here that they did not desire us to assist them in that way. They did wish the powerful influence of the United States in their behalf. They desired only, however, that we should recognize their belligerent rights.

For two years war bloody and cruel had been going on between Spain and the Cubans, the latter fighting for freedom, the former that she might hold her sway over an unwilling people. This struggle has attracted the attention of the entire civilized world. In this country the sympathies of the people went out to those struggling patriots, and the demand came from every village and hamlet, from every section, North, South, East, and West, that Cuba should be free. To these sentiments the Administration for a time turned a deaf ear; it was not even willing to accord to the Cubans the only recognition they had ever asked—that of belligerent rights.



They asked no more than this because they considered themselves capable, if belligerent rights were accorded them, of coping with the Spaniards in this war for liberty. But that was not all. They had other reasons for not desiring such a war. They were afraid of the result to them of a war between this country and Spain. They knew full well that war meant the occupation of Cuba by us, and the fear was natural that even this Government, though founded upon the principles of liberty, might not be able to resist the temptation to remain once the Stars and Stripes should float over the island. Examples such as this were not wanting in history. Other nations during the centuries that have gone had undertaken to do similar acts of benevolence and had not been able to resist the temptation, and why, thought the Cubans, should not this Government be liable to the same temptation.

Finally the President concluded that war, ostensibly at least, for the liberation of Cuba should be waged, and on the 11th day of April, 1898, sent a message to Congress, breathing the very spirit of freedom and philanthropy as well as of defiance to the power of Spain, practically recommending a declaration of war.

Meanwhile the American people began to doubt and fear the motives, not perhaps of the President, but those who surrounded and advised him, and the demand was made that if war were declared some guaranty of good faith on our part should be given. In obedience to this sentiment the instrument by which war was declared proclaimed that the people of the island of Cuba were and of a right ought to be free and independent.

But that was not all this remarkable document, which will ever live in history as the grandest triumph of our Christian civilization or the blackest exhibition of national perfidy the world has ever seen, contained; for it further declared that the United States had no disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserted the determination of the American Government that when this should have been accomplished to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people.

Upon this declaration we unsheathed the sword, broke the Spanish power almost in a day, and liberated the Cubans from the Spanish yoke.

But how have we kept faith with them? For nearly three years the Spaniard has been gone, the island has been absolutely quiet, and peace has reigned from one end of the island to the other. The Cubans have been ready to establish a stable government, and have been capable of so doing. Yet our Army is still there. The island is still under military control, while we come now with the proposition to hold on to Cuba forever. True, the resolution makes no such claim. Oh, no! It is too artfully drawn for that. Why, it actually starts out with the statement "that in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled 'For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba,' etc., the President is hereby authorized to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

## I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

## II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

## III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

## IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

## V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

## VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

## VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the govern-

ment of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coal-ing or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

## VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

Now, these provisions are in absolute violation of the compact under which we undertook to aid the Cubans. We agreed that we had no intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the island except for its pacification, and asserted our determination when that had been accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people; while our proposition now is to create a condition of things by which we are to hold on to the island indefinitely. The proposition to leave the island to the control of the Cubans is absolutely inconsistent with that to restrict the power of the Cuban government in the matter of contracting debts, with the right to "intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence," with that restricting the right of immigration to the island, as also with that reserving to the United States coaling stations on the island.

Why, Mr. Speaker, what nation can be free with all these restrictions upon its freedom of action? No Commonwealth in this Union of indissoluble States but has more freedom of action than Cuba will have under the plan for her control by the United States as embodied in these eight provisions. What State but has the power, so far as the Constitution and laws of the United States are concerned, to contract debts to any amount, even to the verge of bankruptcy if it so desires?

Into what State is immigration restricted? Why, sir, no State in the Union but that throws open wide its doors to immigrants from all civilized lands. It is by that means largely that this country has grown great and strong. Yet we say to the Cubans that colonization, which means immigration, shall not be allowed into that country. Of course, this right of emigrating to Cuba from the United States is not denied, for it is no doubt the intention, as well as the hope, that Cuba shall be colonized from our own country; but the emigrant from every other nation is debarred from the island and the Cuban government can not invite them without the risk of rendering such action obnoxious to the provisions just cited, and of incurring our displeasure, for we are to be the judges at all times as to whether any given act is an infringement of this or any other provision in the proposed amendments. And thus the sword of Damocles is to be forever suspended over the Cuban people and their government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all this is rank injustice and ought not to be done by a great and magnanimous nation to a weaker one, and of whose people when we thrust ourselves between them and those who would coerce them we declared were, and of a right ought to be, free and independent. Yet we should have some concessions, I grant you, but these should be sought along the line of proper trade relations.

Now, what are the reasons assigned for this continued control of Cuba, in violation of our solemn pledge?

First it is said that in some way we have obligations growing out of the treaty of Paris which necessitate a constant and perpetual supervision of Cuban affairs, but I undertake to say that we owe no such duty. What was this undertaking? It is to be found in Article I of that treaty, and is as follows:

Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

Thus we are to assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of our occupation of Cuba for the protection of life and property. But how long was the occupancy to last? Only until the island should be pacified; and I assert that it has been in that condition for more than two years. No people have ever been less turbulent; no country more peaceable. Hence the occupancy should end, and with it our obligations under the Paris treaty.

Again, it is said that the Cubans are not capable of self-government, but this, too, is a mistake. The Cubans, or those of them belonging to the white race, are the descendants of a proud and once powerful people who for more than a century dominated the globe. They have fallen into adversity, it is true, and have lost their political prestige, but they have retained their intellectual power and self-respect. The Cuban census, taken under the auspices of the War Department of the American Government, shows that the native whites constitute 58 per cent of the total population and the foreign whites 9 per cent, making a total of 67 per cent in all belonging to the white race, while of the entire population above the age of 10 years three-fourths can read and write.

Can we boast of a degree of education and literary advancement much higher than that? I think not, at least in many sections of the country. So, too, in the matter of industrial pursuits they will compare favorably with the people in our own country. In the United States 58 per cent of the population are at work or engaged



in occupations for gain. In Cuba 68 per cent are similarly employed, and thus again the comparison between the Cuban people and our own is in favor of the former. We have, Mr. Speaker, anarchists and turbulent spirits everywhere, but they are not found among the laboring classes or breadwinners in any country.

Certainly such people are capable of self-government, and as a matter of fact they have shown themselves to be thus capable. In June of last year municipal elections were held everywhere throughout the island. These elections were peaceable and attended without a single disturbance, although the United States soldiers were not present, so it is said.

And what of the constitution they have prepared? It provides for a republican form of government, founded upon the true principles of liberty, and is modeled after our own Government. If left to themselves, their government will be what it should be—a government of the Cubans, by the Cubans, and for the Cubans. I have not seen the constitution, it is true, for we are called upon to act before that instrument has been submitted to this country; but if newspaper reports are to be believed the constitution recently framed by the Cuban convention leaves little to be desired in addition to the work already done by that convention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are those, and they constitute a respectable minority, who claim to believe that we should create a protectorate or suzerainty over that island, and the amendments to the Army bill which we are now discussing are designed to bring about that condition. But, sir, this, too, is unnecessary, for the Monroe doctrine, established three-quarters of a century ago and recognized and acquiesced in by all the great powers of the earth, affords sufficient protection to Cuba and her republican form of government. In the face of that doctrine no foreign nation could interfere with Cuba so as to change her form of government or to take permanent possession of the island.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, each of the amendments is in violation of our pledges contained in the declaration of war between this country and Spain. They furnish such a violation of a solemn compact as would not be tolerated in the case of any individual, and the same moral code by which individuals are to be governed should likewise govern that aggregation of individuals called the United States.

Now, I know that our Republican friends claim that in all this there is no intention to annex Cuba to the United States; but, sir, the tendency is in that direction, and while it may not take place this year or next, or even for a decade, the danger is imminent. Should it come, and free trade exist between this country and that island, the American people, as I have shown on other occasions, will receive no benefit from such a condition. Cuba can and will in that event supply this country with all the smoking tobacco, cigars, and sugar our people can consume, and thus destroy these industries in every State in the Union where they exist. My own State would be one of the chief sufferers, but she would not suffer alone, for perhaps 30 others would sustain irreparable injury, so far as some of these industries are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not enter into any exhaustive argument as to our power under the Constitution to do what we are trying to do by these amendments to the appropriation bill, but I believe the whole principle contended for by the leaders on the other side is outside of the Constitution of the United States. I can find no warrant whatever therein for the creation of a condition of things such as these amendments, even if accepted by the Cubans, will create. The Constitution does not provide for the establishment by this country of a protectorate or a suzerainty over any other country. I can find in the Constitution no warrant for the owning or controlling by this Government of foreign lands or countries except for the purpose of eventually bringing them into the Union as States. Indeed, such a condition is not consonant with our theory of government, which is founded upon the idea that all just powers of government must come from the consent of the governed.

Mr. Speaker, we have done many things during the past two and one-half years that we ought not to have done, many things which have caused a dangerous and unnecessary strain upon our form of government and upon our institutions. From these and their resultant conditions we may not now be able to turn away; but we yet have time to retrace our steps and to do justice to the Cubans and incidentally to ourselves. Of us much is expected. To us have been given more than ten talents. Let us, therefore, improve them in the interest of freedom and humanity. The opportunities for good, such as have not in all the years of the past come to any other nation or people, have come to us in our present relations with the Cuban people; opportunities which, if improved, as they may be improved, will shed luster upon our national life, both past and future.

Let us, then, keep faith with our neighbors across the Gulf, and in our treatment of them erect one more monument to liberty and civilization among those already builded by us along our national pathway during the century which has just taken its place among the ages which are gone.

Mr. SULZER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has ingrafted upon this bill—a measure appropriating the enormous sum of \$120,000,000 for the support of our military establishment—two amendments embodying propositions so obnoxious to my sense of justice and fair dealing, and so utterly at variance with my conception of the powers vested by the Constitution in Congress, and the views which I entertain as to the policy which the United States should pursue toward the inhabitants of Cuba and the Philippine Islands, that I desire to enter my earnest protest against their adoption.

But, before I enter upon the discussion of this most important subject, let me call attention to a statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. That gentleman made an assertion which I can not permit to go unchallenged. In concluding his remarks upon the resolution now before the House he declared that when the Porto Rican act was under consideration here the Democrats denounced in unmeasured terms the provision which imposed tariff duties on all merchandise coming into the United States from Porto Rico and coming into Porto Rico from the United States, but that so well pleased were the people of Porto Rico with this tariff tax of 15 per cent of the duties imposed by the Dingley act that their legislative assembly, although it was perfectly competent for it to do so by the passage of a simple resolution, had adjourned without removing this customs duty. In other words, that the people of Porto Rico had, after an experience of nearly two years in paying this, as I believe, unconstitutional tax, deliberately, and of their own free choice, elected to continue paying it.

Mr. Speaker, there was never a more misleading and unfounded statement made upon this floor. The act of Congress of April 12, 1900, entitled "An act to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," contains these words:

Whenever the legislative assembly of Porto Rico shall have enacted and put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of the government of Porto Rico, by this act established, and shall by resolution duly passed so notify the President, he shall make proclamation thereof, and thereupon all tariff duties on merchandise and articles going into Porto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Porto Rico shall cease, and from and after such date all such merchandise and articles shall be entered at the several ports of entry free of duty.

This is the provision, and the only provision, of the Porto Rican act to which the gentleman from Ohio could have referred as enabling the legislature of Porto Rico to rid the people of that island of this tariff tax. By it the legislative assembly of Porto Rico is empowered "to enact and put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of the government of Porto Rico," and that has been done. I hold in my hand an act passed by the legislative assembly of Porto Rico at its recent session, approved by Governor Charles H. Allen on the 31st day of January last, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the people of Porto Rico, and for other purposes." It covers 33 closely printed pages, and provides a complete system of taxation for the people of Porto Rico, and the President of the United States has been duly notified thereof, as is required in the act from which I have quoted. So it seems that instead of being well satisfied to pay this unjust, discriminating, and, as I believe, unconstitutional tax, the Cuban people have done all in their power to rid themselves of it forever, and their action is a complete and absolute refutation of the unwarranted statement made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, more than two years have elapsed since the establishment of peace between the United States and Spain. The pacification of the island of Cuba has been accomplished, and its people have called a convention and framed for themselves a constitution. By an act of Congress approved by President McKinley on the 20th day of April, 1898, it was declared:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

There can be no mistaking the language of these resolutions. They were carefully drawn and clearly worded. They were written to be read of all men. They declare, in language dear to every citizen of this American Republic, that the people of Cuba "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent." We not only declared to Spain that the people of Cuba, then struggling to free



themselves from Spanish tyranny, were free and independent, but we proclaimed to the wide world that they were, and that they were entitled to enjoy their freedom and independence. We went even further. We disclaimed both the disposition and the intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the islands save only for the purpose of pacification.

When law and order were established our troops were to be withdrawn and the island left to the control of its people. How have these pledges been redeemed? Thus far, what single step has been taken in the direction of their redemption? Is it seriously maintained that the fulfillment of this solemn pledge is to be found in the Platt amendment, placed by the Senate upon the Army bill, and placed there in violation of every rule of parliamentary procedure? I can not believe it. The pledge which we gave to the people of Cuba was unqualified; was accompanied with no conditions, no limitations and no restrictions. And yet we say to this people in this amendment that, as a condition precedent to the withdrawal of the troops of the United States, you shall engage "never" to "enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, or in manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain, by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island."

We say they shall agree, before we will give them the freedom we promised, that they shall "not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of the government, shall be inadequate." We insist upon reserving "the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence." We arrogate unto ourselves the right to require that the Cubans shall execute certain plans and devise others "for the sanitation of the cities of the island;" we demand "that the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba," and, lastly, we stipulate that "the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specific points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States." Gentlemen tell us these stipulations are all reasonable, and most of them are necessary to safeguard the interests and protect the health of the people of the United States.

My reply is that they are inconsistent with the full and complete enjoyment by the people of Cuba of sovereign rights which we are in honor bound to respect, and therefore violative of a most solemn pledge given the people of the whole world as well as those of Cuba. I do not believe this great, enlightened, and Christian nation can afford to commit an act of such palpable injustice and such glaring bad faith. There is no immediate necessity for any Congressional action, and certainly no earthly excuse for this hasty, ill-advised, and perfidious legislation, likely at any moment to provoke hostilities between the United States and the very people for the establishment of whose freedom and independence we waged a costly and a bloody war with the Kingdom of Spain.

That this bill, as it has been amended, will be enacted into law, thus carrying out to the uttermost the programme of President McKinley and his advisers, I do not for one moment doubt. If it be the desire and the purpose of those who are directing the affairs of our Government and who are responsible for this vicious proposition—to drive the Cuban people into open revolt, I can conceive of no surer means for the accomplishment of that end. Is it to be expected that a high-spirited people like the Cubans will be content with an American protectorate when they were promised freedom and absolute independence? I do not believe that the framers of this faith-breaking amendment even hope that they will. Their desire and evident purpose is to arouse in the Cubans a spirit of resistance.

Mr. Speaker, bad as is the legislation proposed in the amendment which relates to Cuba, it does not compare in atrocity to the Spooner amendment, which is intended to place in the hands of one man all legislative, executive, and judicial power over the lives, liberties, and fortunes of the ten or twelve million of human beings who inhabit the Philippine Islands. Such legislation as this is not only unparalleled in the history of legislative enactments, but it is absolutely subversive of those principles of free government upon which the American Republic is founded.

For two years President McKinley, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has been attempting to establish, at the point of the bayonet, a military despotism in the Philippine Islands.

Now he asks for, and is to be given by a subservient Congress, authority to establish a civil government with undefined and absolute powers, to be supported, of course, by a powerful military establishment. The amendment, or that part of it which clothes the President with autocratic power for an indefinite period, is in these words:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th

day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that such absolute and unrestricted power as is contained in this amendment was ever before conferred upon any ruler, in any age, by any people, in any quarter of the civilized globe. That it is within the constitutional power of Congress to confer upon any man, or any set of men, such absolute undefined and unlimited power, I can not believe. The Constitution declares that:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

The power to legislate for territory belonging to the United States is expressly conferred upon the legislative branch of our Government, and it must be that Congress can not delegate that power to the Chief Executive, to be by him in turn delegated to an irresponsible commission. There is no excuse for this ill-advised and unprecedented action. We are now within three days of the closing hour of this Congress. If this pernicious legislation is necessary now, it was necessary when the Fifty-sixth Congress assembled more than a year ago. It comes now coupled with the threat that unless the power demanded is given the President he will call the Fifty-seventh Congress together in extraordinary session, and cause to be enacted legislation affecting the Filipinos even more vicious than that which is now proposed.

This Congress is arrogantly told that unless it accedes to the demands of the President another Congress, more largely Republican, and therefore more subservient, will be immediately convened and legislation enacted more objectionable even than this. Speaking for myself, an extra session, under circumstances such as these, could have no possible terrors for me. Thus, Mr. Speaker, is to be extorted from Congress the most shameful and pernicious enactment that ever blotted the legislative history of the American Republic—legislation which the wisest and most patriotic of all the Presidents of these United States would have shrunk from executing if required to do so. It has been said upon this floor and elsewhere—and a Republican press has published it abroad over the land—that this Spooner amendment was an exact reproduction of the language of the act of 1803.

It is true that a portion of the language of the act of 1803, authorizing President Jefferson and his appointees to establish temporarily a civil government in the Louisiana Territory, has been incorporated in the Spooner amendment; but an examination and comparison of the one with the other will, I think, demonstrate very clearly that the two are in no wise analogous. The distinction between the two acts is as broad as the different purposes to be served could make them. They are totally and radically dissimilar in most essential particulars. The Louisiana act is in these words:

Until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said Territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

The treaty under which the Louisiana Territory was acquired provided in terms that its inhabitants should become citizens of the United States, and as such be entitled to enjoy all the rights and privileges attaching under our Constitution to that citizenship. The Paris treaty, under which we are attempting to subjugate and hold the Philippine Islands, contains no such provision. On the contrary, it was solemnly declared not to be our purpose to confer upon the Filipinos the rights and privileges of American citizens at the very time of the ratification of the Spanish treaty. The act of 1803 conferred no legislative authority upon the President and his agents. It recognized the existence of a civil government and authorized the President to administer laws then in existence. It was intended to be temporary and provisional, and was in effect for less than five months.

The Spooner amendment, as I have already said, confers legislative and judicial as well as executive powers upon the persons appointed by the President as the instruments to carry into effect his autocratic and unlimited powers, and there is no limitation placed upon the period during which they may be exercised. The same persons who are to make the laws for the Filipinos may construe and execute those laws. The property, liberty, and lives of millions of human beings are placed absolutely at the mercy of one man and his irresponsible satraps. It is not true, as has been said, that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has this absolute power now. If that were true we would not be called upon to enact the legislation embodied in this Spooner amendment. As Commander in Chief of the Army the President would not dare exercise such vast and unlimited powers as are now to be conferred upon him by Congress. It is difficult to realize the extent and tremendous scope of these powers.



A carbetbag government is to be established and numberless fat offices created. Thousands of civil officers are to be appointed and millions of dollars expended by one individual, without accountability therefor. No such absolute, autocratic, despotic, imperialistic, and monstrous power was ever exercised by the Czar of all the Russias. The very contemplation of what is in store for the downtrodden Filipino is appalling to one who believes in the principles of free self-government and is not dead to every sense of justice. When the people grow weary of the task of self-government and turn it over to any man, be he the best and greatest of men, it must inevitably prove the commencement of that fatal descent which in the history of nations has been so rarely checked.

Mr. Speaker, I realize to-day as never before during my whole service in this House, that that "eternal vigilance" which is the "price of freedom" has been lulled to sleep, and that if it is ever to be awakened again the liberty-loving people of this great Republic must shake off the fatal lethargy by which they now seem oppressed and once more assert their right to govern themselves and to direct and control their own affairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SULZER. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the resolutions known as the Spooner resolutions, placed on this bill as a rider in the Senate, raise two very important questions. First, what steps, if any, should now be taken to define our future attitude toward the republic of Cuba; and, second, shall the Congress definitively sanction the establishment of arbitrary government in the Philippine Islands, ignoring the Constitution, and invest the President with the powers of all?

Concerning the proposal to lay down, at this time, ironclad instructions for the guidance of the constitutional convention now in session at Habana and the government it is about to establish, I desire to make a few observations. I concur in the views of many of my colleagues, who have declared in my presence that in respect to several matters of the utmost importance it is the duty of this Government, and its right, to have something to say as to the affairs of Cuba.

I am of opinion that the question should not be broached by this Government until the Cuban constitutional convention shall have finished its work. It has agreed upon a constitution for the republic. The Cubans know what we desire, and their representatives have under consideration at this time the very matters to which the pending resolution refers.

News comes from Cuba that no objection will be interposed to a stipulation guarding this country against the danger of treaties with foreign countries inimical to the interests of the United States. I am glad to know this, for I unhesitatingly declare that it is not only the right but the duty of this country to supervise the foreign power relations of the island in such a way and to such an extent as will save Cuba from embroilment with foreign powers. I think we should see to it also that Cuba shall contract no debts or obligations of a nature or in quarters which might in the future imperil her safety.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago the German Emperor sent a man-of-war to the island of Santo Domingo as the bearer of a sight draft against the Government of that island. Bombardment and invasion were threatened, and the poor islanders were compelled to pay the claim. Five or six years ago Nicaragua was invaded by the English and a similar outrage was perpetrated there. Are these cases to be regarded as precedents?

Our Government made no protest, and so the proceeding was at least tacitly approved at Washington. It may be said the claims were just, but who knows they were just? The little Republics thus assailed demanded arbitration, and the fact that it was refused is some evidence that they were robbed.

The United States is bound by the highest considerations to safeguard Cuba against similar complications; for, Mr. Speaker, any attempt of a foreign power to repeat in Cuba the proceedings in Santo Domingo and Nicaragua, to which I have referred, would not be tolerated by the United States. To put it plainly, whatever would endanger Cuba in the future is of interest to the people of the United States, and it is only reasonable that we should seek to throw about the island such safeguards as are manifestly necessary to her safety.

I do not believe we have any right to demand the cession of coaling stations in Cuba, or that we have any right to lay claim to the Isle of Pines or any other appanage of the island. I deplore the fact that any such demand is to be made, for I firmly believe it will lead to friction and probably to disaster.

I deplore the fact that any demands whatever should be made upon the island while the representatives of its people are in session considering the very questions dealt with in this resolution. Under such circumstances any action whatever on our part is an insult. We have no right to suspend over the heads of the delegates to the Habana convention as a menace the sword of a dictator.

I firmly believe that as to all matters concerning which we have reasonably a right to be consulted the people of Cuba stand ready to make most ample concessions. To project into the deliberations of the constitutional convention this brutal threat of intervention in the affairs of the islands if this or that be done or omitted is to endanger the peace of the island and may lead to a tragedy. Sir, we are not unfamiliar with conditions existing in Cuba.

We know that in the island are numerous factions, each anxious to gain ascendancy in public affairs. We know that naturally the inhabitants are intensely jealous of any interference of Americans in the affairs of their country. We know that the designing demagogue is sure to call in question any concessions made by the constitutional convention. We know that as a result of a decade of civil war the island has suffered pitiable demoralization, and that its chief danger arises from the presence of a large class, debased by evil environments, ready for the resumption of the life of the guerrilla soldier, because they would rather fight than work.

Mr. Speaker, to this debased element and to over-zealous patriots who will be angered by this unjustifiable proceeding, the demagogues and the disturbers of the peace who make no concealment of their hostility to Americans will appeal. By these classes the patriotic men of the Cuban constitutional convention must expect to be assailed. No matter how well the work intrusted to them may be performed—no matter if the concessions made to the United States be plainly for the best interests of Cuba, still there is small hope that the members of the convention will escape bitter denunciation and unwarranted criticism. By passing this resolution we multiply the difficulties with which they are dealing.

We put a club into the hands of their enemies. Sir, the ink will not be dry upon the Presidential sanction of this measure before Cuba will be ringing with denunciations of those responsible for its passage and any Cubans who favor compliance with its requirements. And may Heaven decree that nothing worse than verbal warfare may result from it. Deplorable indeed is the fact that the party in power feels constrained to take a step which will unmistakably tend to prevent the growth of affection for the great Republic in the hearts of the people of the island, for of all the Spanish-American states of whom Columbia is the mother, Cuba should be her favorite daughter.

Sir, from the beginning I have looked forward to the time when, amid joyous acclamation of her people, Cuba will seek political union with the United States, and I condemn not only as unwise, but as criminal, a measure which assuredly will postpone, if it does not wholly prevent, this consummation so devoutly to be wished. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the resolution providing for what has been misnamed civil government in the Philippine Islands marks the passage of the line which separates the republic from the empire. Its passage will accomplish the revolution foreshadowed soon after the occupation of Manila by American troops.

The first step in the direction of this revolution in our form of government was taken when we bought from Spain a country of which Spain did not have possession, and to which, under old-fashioned American ideas, she had no shadow of a title—a country which had cast off by force of arms a government of force endured for centuries, and which, when we purchased it, was in the hands of its inhabitants, its only legitimate owners.

The next step was taken when our army in the Philippines was ordered to overthrow the domestic institutions of the islands and forcibly subject them to American rule. Upon the assumption that the end has been reached or is near at hand, this, the final step, is about to establish over there a government essentially arbitrary, possessing unlimited power over the inhabitants, who henceforth are to have no voice in choosing their officers, or in devising laws for the imposition of taxes, or in controlling public expenditures, or in the enactment of the laws under which they are to live.

Mr. Speaker, if the fundamental precepts of liberty professed by the founders of this Government, inscribed in its Constitution and the amendments thereto, and heretofore proclaimed by Americans of all parties as the very formula of freedom, applicable to all classes and all lands—if government by force is violation of republican principles and despotic invasion of the rights of men—then certainly the departure we are making accomplishes a complete revolution in our institutions.

It vests in the President, as ruler of the Philippine Islands, executive, legislative, and judicial powers. What is the difference between the republic and the empire? Why, in the republic the executive possesses only executive powers. The people, through their representatives, make the laws, and courts chosen by the people construe them.

In the empire the emperor—one man—personally or through agencies of his own choosing, exercises all these powers. Tell me, then, when this law shall be placed on the statute books, will the Philippine Islands enjoy the blessings of the Republic, or be



compelled to endure the hardship of living under an absolute government? Our Chief Executive will continue to be the President of the United States, presumably restrained by its limitations.

He will become the ruler of the Philippine Islands, exercising all governmental powers, with no limitations whatever upon his exercise of power, and may deal arbitrarily with the laws, fortunes, happiness, and destiny of 12,000,000 people who are to be brought by force under his dominion and control. Deny it as you will, but as sure as God reigns, henceforth the President of the United States will be the emperor of the Philippine Islands. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SULZER. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK].

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a criminal farce to force to a vote a question of such gravity as this without debate, for the few minutes yielded to its discussion can not be dignified with the name of debate. There is hardly time to protest against this outrage upon the right of free speech in this House of the people, much less to debate the merits of the question upon which we are to vote.

The majority have no respect, even for the appearance of decency, in their headlong haste to perpetrate this crowning act of a shameful and iniquitous programme. An act which attacks the very fundamental principles of our free Government and disgraces forever the fair name of our country is to be hurried to completion with such swiftness that there is hardly an opportunity for honesty to utter its indignant protest against the crime.

This is no time, Mr. Speaker, to mince words. The passage of the so-called Spooner and Platt amendments will be an act of infamy, and every man who votes for them willfully, deliberately, and premeditatedly becomes a party to the crime. This, sir, is but one more chapter in this Administration's monotonous and unbroken record of perfidy, falsehood, and dishonor. I believe it will be the deliberate judgment of history that no Administration in this country, or in any other civilized land, has ever shown such brazen and cynical contempt for the nation's honor or for its own.

When the future historian comes to write the story of this Administration, he will search in vain for a single promise which it has not violated or a single trust which it has not betrayed. Sir, the sickening laudation which craven politicians in this House or in the other lavish upon the President and his Administration may be rewarded with official favors, and thereby answer the only purpose they were intended to serve, but courtiers and flunkies do not write history. They can not change the historical facts of this controversy, and these facts rise up in judgment against this Administration.

The President of the United States in a solemn message to Congress declared that the forcible annexation of a country without the consent of its people would be a crime. He is now using all the military and naval power of the United States and wasting without stint the blood and treasure of his country to commit the very crime he then denounced. This Congress passed a resolution declaring that the people of Cuba were, and of right ought to be, free and independent. Not content with that, it expressly disavowed, by solemn resolution, any intention to exercise authority over the people of Cuba, but declared that as soon as peace should be restored the people of that island should be left free and independent. The President of the United States, in a message to Congress, declared that this was a pledge, an obligation binding upon the honor and the conscience of the country, and that it must be sacredly kept.

Mr. Speaker, when the President made that declaration in his message, I, for one, dismissed as groundless and unworthy the suspicion that the Administration harbored a secret design to violate its promise and to overthrow by force the liberties of the people of Cuba. But who can say now that the President has a right to be trusted when he has given his word? That there should be close political and commercial relations between this country and Cuba I fully agree; that by dealing with these people in a frank and friendly spirit we could have obtained everything we had any right or reason to ask for, I have no doubt whatever. What, sir, is the meaning of these conditions which we seek to impose on the people of Cuba?

I put to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] the question as to what the Government proposes to do in the event the people of Cuba should refuse to accept these limitations upon their independence. He sought to evade the question, but finally answered that this proposition was our ultimatum to Cuba. An ultimatum, Mr. Speaker, presents an alternative of war. "Submit to these terms or I come upon you with fire and sword"—that, sir, is an ultimatum, and that is what the gentleman from Ohio tells us is the intent and purpose of this Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at some of the arguments that have been made by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. Some of them, carried to their logical conclusion, go to the extent of justifying human slavery as it once existed in this

country, and some of the very precedents now cited to justify this Administration were damned by the Republican party in the first breath of its existence.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] shakes in our face the Ostend manifesto, which the Republican party denounced in unmeasured terms in its first platform, and which many people had come to believe was buried beneath a weight of obloquy beyond all hope of resurrection. Other gentlemen cast into our teeth the laws of many Southern States, which they charge are intended to disfranchise the negro. Mr. Speaker, we have heard these accusations in the past, but they come to us now with a different meaning. They were once uttered to bring shame and reproach upon the Democratic party. They are now cited to justify the course and policy of the Republican party.

At one time the Republican party and Mr. McKinley himself used to denounce us for violating the principles of the Declaration of Independence by our restrictive legislation against the negroes; but now we are given to understand that they propose to follow our example. Mr. Speaker, I wish that I had the time and the opportunity to deal with the attempt to show a parallel between some of the laws of the Southern States and the policy of the Administration in the Philippine Islands. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that if it be true that we have any people under our flag with respect to whom we can not act in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, it is unfortunate that it should be so, and if that condition did not already exist I would not go 10,000 miles away to wage a bloody and costly and destructive war in order to create it.

Let me say, further, that it is one thing to leave a people of an inferior race to govern themselves in their own country and according to their own laws and customs and state of civilization, and it is quite another thing to let such a people make and administer laws for you. I would never consent that the people of the Philippine Islands should share in the government of this country, for while I think they can govern themselves I do not believe they are fit to govern us.

But all these things, Mr. Speaker, do not touch the fact that we have bound ourselves by a most solemn pledge not to do the very thing we are doing now. The Republican party and this Administration proposes to violate that pledge upon the cold-blooded plea that there is profit in dishonor and money in crime.

Mr. SULZER. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the soldiers in the Army of the United States being paid. In opposing this bill I am not striking at our soldiers. I am opposed to the whole miserable policy which forces upon the American freeman and taxpayer an Army so large as to make it cost five times as much as it did four years ago; but the American soldier should bear no part of the blame. It is his part to obey orders; it is his to do, to suffer, even to die in obedience to orders, and we honor him for his sturdy courage and patience. Bad as was this bill when it left the House in enormous expenditure, it was unobjectionable compared to the bill as it is returned to us with its infamous amendments. To the amendments, Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks. Out in Missouri in 1900, when I declared in public speeches that "the Republican party did not intend to live up to our honorable declarations regarding Cuba," that it was the intention of the Administration to violate our pledged faith and steal Cuba, I was denounced as a partisan falsifier. I wish I had been mistaken in my statements, but these amendments bear me out.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to amendments concerning Cuba. I think it proper just here to see what we said when we were about to go to war with Spain. Let honest Americans who have some regard for national honor read:

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited; Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.



Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

THOMAS B. REED,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

GARRET A. HOBART,

Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate.

Approved, April 20, 1898.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

Mr. Speaker, before this proposed legislation is enacted into law there ought to be a resolution pass the American Congress absolutely and unqualifiedly repudiating the resolutions of Congress approved April 20, 1898. Men ought at least to be brave when they determine to enact villainous legislation; legislators should not enact villainies under shadow or cover. The Congress should boldly say: We fooled the world when we made it believe that we went into war with Spain to avenge our honor or in the interest of humanity; Congress ought not to hide any further: the Administration and its Congress ought now to mean what they say, and to do that, should repudiate all declarations of the past.

I have just quoted the action of Congress on April 20, 1898; now, what is proposed in this bill?

The text of the Cuban amendment is as follows:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

I. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

II. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island after defraying the current expenses of government shall be inadequate.

#### THE RIGHT OF INTERVENTION.

III. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

IV. That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

V. That the government of Cuba will execute and as far as necessary extend the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future judgment by treaty.

VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

VIII. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

Here is notice served on the people of Cuba:

Put the substance of these declarations into your constitution or the United States will maintain its military control of your territory.

The United States shall be suzerain over Cuba, we here boldly say by an amendment to an appropriation bill, or we will not remove the military forces of this Government from Cuban territory. We demand of the convention now preparing a constitution for the government of Cuba that it shall solemnly agree that the United States shall be permitted to assume a protectorate and become suzerain over Cuba or we will hold and exercise authority with the mailed hand of military power.

By the amendments to this bill we assert our right to stand in the same relation to Cuba that Great Britain did to the Boer republics, which she has recently destroyed and for which she is denounced by the great majority of Americans.

That is a shrewdly constructed clause which demands that the United States may "exercise the right to intervene for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty." Under this clause our Government may on the slightest pretext pour into Cuba soldiers to suppress outbreaks of internal troubles.

Section 4 proposes to validate all acts of the United States while in the island, and particularly to validate rights acquired while we were in possession. It is meant here to fasten on the constitution of Cuba all franchises procured while we held military possession. It is meant to force the Cubans to indorse all unconscionable contracts made for the benefit of corporations. In this

clause the Republican party proposes to keep faith with the plunderers who have furnished the funds to keep it in power.

Mr. Speaker, these declarations which come to us from the other end, and which this majority will soon fasten on this bill, and which by the signature of the Executive will soon become an act of Congress, show the inconsistency, the lack of good faith of the party that said in their national platform of June, 1900:

To Cuba, independence and self-government were assured in the same voice by which war was declared, and to the letter this pledge shall be performed.

And this bill will doubtless be signed by the same Executive who said: "Forcible annexation would be criminal aggression." Within the week the American Congress will spit on, repudiate the promise we made to the people of Cuba, to ourselves, and to the world in the declaration:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

When it is done this Government will be dishonored, because a government is dishonored when it breaks faith, and we will be doing it for the meanest of reasons—material advantage. It is said we have a right to supervise Cuba in her treaties and other obligations because of our assertion and maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. I deny it. As an American and Democrat I deny it.

The doctrine that takes the name of the patriot and democrat who left his blood on Revolutionary battlefields and who gave us a wise, brave, patriotic Administration, goes to no such lengths. The true, honest American doctrine is to permit the people of Cuba to establish a government of their own, under our solemn pledges made to them and to the world, demanding no cession of territory as our right; no demand of military, naval, or coaling stations; no demand that dishonest bargains be validated; no suggestion that the military of our Government will continue to control. When Cuba has a government, when she is sovereign, then if a foreign power shall endeavor to encompass her sovereignty in any way, or make demands detrimental to our rights as we declare them under the Monroe doctrine, we can say, we must say, no. We shall then declare the United States stands by to see the liberties of Cubans preserved and our own rights on this hemisphere observed. This is not only the honest American doctrine, but is the true democratic doctrine. We have no right to put Cuba into "leading strings." These amendments are not put on this Army appropriation bill for Cuba's good, but to make excuse for keeping soldiers of this country in Cuba and to validate franchises procured by scoundrels while our Army was in control there. The Republican party ought to stand out in the open.

Mr. Speaker, your party is in full and complete control of every branch of this Government. The Cubans, who have longed for liberty and fought for freedom so faithfully, are at the mercy of this Government, which is in control of the Republican party, and your party is owned, body and soul, by a conscienceless lot of looters and plunderers. Sir, the great Republican party, that is just about to begin a new lease of power, should not shuffle in this matter. Be brave enough to say that you have made these dishonorable demands on the people of Cuba, expecting them to refuse, and that it is then your intention to maintain military supremacy. Say boldly that you intend to back up the buzzards that are preying on the prostrate Cubans by driving hard bargains and procuring by intrigue special privileges.

Sir, your leaders boast of Republican courage; now exhibit it. Announce to the world that you intend, though Cuba is now pacified, to repudiate section 4 of the joint resolution of April 20, 1898. Say you intend to make the United States an Ananias. Tell the world that the United States is in Republican control, and that means the control of plutocrats, who have no regard for the honor and pledged faith of the great Republic. This bill lacks one amendment to complete your real meaning. You should add: "Resolved, that Cuba contains good stealing for more Neelys and Rathbones; that her people can not help themselves, and we intend by these amendments to drive the Cubans into desperation and then to boldly take the island and make of it what we propose to make of the Philippines—a plundering ground for trusts and syndicates."

Men trained in the real faith of the Democratic fathers believe that our Government ought always to encourage liberty; to see that "equal and exact justice" is dealt to all men; to use all our power as the favored people of the earth to see that free government is encouraged everywhere, and especially in the Western Hemisphere; that when any people in North or South America, or the islands adjacent, declare and maintain a government of their own, that foreign people shall be told that no interference will be tolerated by the United States which affects the integrity of such governments. And the true American, the faithful American Democrat, believes that such base repudiation of our pledges to the Cuban people as is meant by the amendments to this bill is perfidy; that the President, who signed the Teller resolution, was right in declaring that the "highest honorable obligation rests on this Government to carry out the provisions of our pledge."



And we believe that no excuse can be offered for refusal to stand by that pledge that will not emphasize our national disgrace. In that resolution we affirmed that the people of the island of Cuba were and of right ought to be free and independent, and I voice the belief of Democrats when I denounce the intention of the Administration to repudiate that solemn pledge. The people of Cuba, by their constitutional convention, have adopted a constitution for their government, republican in form, and should be permitted to decide for themselves, as did the Republic of Texas, as to whether they want to become a part of the American Republic, and then it will be time for us to decide whether we will admit Cuba into these United States. Sir, let us be honest with each other. No political student can deny that these amendments destroy the sovereignty of Cuba; no government can be sovereign that is denied the right to make any treaty. We herein demand that she covenant with us for all time not to become sovereign. Mr. Speaker, on this Army appropriation bill, carrying a larger amount of money than is expended by any foreign nation for its army, we have tacked this amendment:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such a manner as the President of the United States shall direct for the establishment of civil government, and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Here we see proposed power unlimited to be given the President. Never before has any Executive of these United States had such power. The curb is to be taken off and free rein given the President.

The President of the United States is a creature of the Federal Constitution. In the States comprising the Federal Union he can have no such authority given him, yet ten millions of people over whom our Government claims dominion, a constitutional Executive of a free republican government is to be given the right to make and judicially construe laws. The advocates of this amendment insist that they have a Democratic precedent during Mr. Jefferson's Administration, in the Louisiana territory. I challenge the assertion. This amendment is not on all fours with authority given Mr. Jefferson. Article 3 of the treaty by which we acquired the Louisiana purchase is as follows:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess.

Here we see that Mr. Jefferson was hedged in by a treaty which has the force of law—to see that this territory be formed into States as soon as practicable. Meanwhile he was compelled to see that the people be protected in their liberties and religion. No such guaranty is given the Filipinos; no promise is made that they shall ever have the proud boast of American citizenship. The reading of Article IX of the Spanish-American treaty, ratified by the United States in February, 1899, says: "The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territory hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress." No treaty rights protect the Filipinos. And now Congress is to surrender its power to legislate, here you are to give the President power to legislate, and he is under no treaty obligation to give to these people at any time the blessings of free government. Mr. Jefferson was bound by treaty, as was the Congress, to carve the territory of Louisiana into sovereign States as soon as practicable. But the majority here insist that the proposed amendment confers the same power that was by act of Congress given to President Jefferson. I deny it. Here is the act of 1803:

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said Territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Approved October 31, 1803.

By its terms the authority for the President to act was limited to the expiration of the session of Congress. Besides, Mr. Jefferson was only authorized to appoint persons to exercise the same powers as were already "exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same." In other words, they were authorized by the President, through Congress, to execute and enforce power existing when the United States made the Louisiana purchase. Another statute was passed in 1804 vesting the power of governing the Louisiana Territory in "a governor and thirteen of the most fit and discreet residents of the territory."

The act of October 31, 1803, was temporary, to continue until Congress could act. We have had such title as Spain could give by quitclaim deed of the Philippine Islands for more than two years. Ample time has been had for organizing a Territorial government, as was done for Louisiana within a year of its purchase, yet the Congress is to turn over the control of the archi-

pelago to the President. And more, the views of Mr. Jefferson, well known to Congress as being in favor of government by the people, made it clear that he would shrink from exercising imperial power. In the Louisiana case the few people then in the territory were protected by treaty, while in the Philippine case the people depend upon the whims of an Executive who can not be depended on to have the same mind on any question very long. Mr. Jefferson believed and taught the blessed doctrine of government by the people, while Mr. McKinley believes in government by force and by manipulation of trusts. Mr. Jefferson fostered liberty. Mr. McKinley fosters commercialism at the expense of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, from the day of our landing at Manila we have fooled the Filipinos. They were our allies before the power of Spain was broken. They were bullied into fighting our soldiers and then pronounced rebels and traitors, though they never did acknowledge allegiance to this Government. You take a people against their will and then proceed to govern them as if these United States had the power of a monarchy. I denounce the whole miserable business as being un-American, undemocratic, unrepugnant. The Republican party is drunk with a renewed lease of power and is determined to exploit Cuba and the Philippines for the benefit of the trusts, no matter how much blood is vomited, no matter how much liberty is destroyed. I expect to see the time come when your crimes will overtake you. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAY. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VANDIVER].

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Speaker, the infamy which this amendment seeks now to legalize is a monstrous outrage upon the Filipino people. It is well illustrated in this modern fable of the eagle and the fish. The eagle having rescued the fish from the hawk, then seeing what a dainty meal he would make, pounced on the fish himself; and as he sails away with his prey the fish makes appeal for liberty and freedom; and the eagle makes this response—the same that McKinley now makes to the plaintive cry of the Filipino:

How ungrateful you are  
Since I've traveled so far  
To emancipate you from  
The tyrannous hawk,  
Thus of freedom to talk,  
And imagine you've a claim  
To the home whence you came.

Indeed, I've designed  
And had only in mind,  
As distinctly I said in my late proclamation,  
To secure for your race  
A superior place  
By means of benevolent assimilation.

[Applause.]

Thus into the air,  
'Spite of protest and prayer,  
The fish goes aloft to the bird's habitation;  
And the bird is so filled  
With the fish that he killed  
That he too dies of benevolent assimilation.

[Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the Republican party propose? Observe, it says "all military and civil and judicial power" is to be vested in the President. His appointees are to be the only legislators also. Is anything lacking to make up imperialism? During the last campaign your party denied the charge that you were seeking to change the character of this Government. You denied that you were imperialists. Everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the continent you proclaimed your love for the Constitution. You professed still to cherish the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence. You laughed to scorn our charge that your party was not faithful to the ideals of this Republic. You succeeded in carrying the election. Now, you openly and boldly repudiate the plain provisions of the Constitution. With unblinking effrontery you even go a step farther and do the very thing we prophesied you would. Here is an amendment that was offered to your proposition in the Senate day before yesterday, and it was defeated by a strict party vote; Senator HOAR was the only Republican Senator who still had courage enough to show his fondness for the Republic and dread of the empire:

And provided further, That no judgment, order, nor act by any of said officials so appointed shall conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Every Republican voted against this amendment except Senator HOAR.

Your party has even refused to make these officers whom you appoint in the Philippines take the ordinary oath required of officers in this country to support the Constitution of the United States. They are merely to be the satraps of His Majesty William of Canton, who is to be enthroned on next Monday.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that nothing I may say, nothing that any man can say on this floor, will change the result. It has been predetermined. Your "boss" has drawn the party lash, and like slaves you will do his bidding. "Base, ignoble slaves," "you crouch and cower like belabored hounds," and do your master's



bidding. It is a shame and disgrace—a foul infamy. The vocabulary of condemnation is too weak to express the profound contempt which your conduct merits. Words are feeble instruments. I would to God I could command some more powerful means of expressing my horror and condemnation of this infamous proceeding.

Men calling themselves gentlemen, and representatives of a Christian country, professing faith in Democratic form of government, now propose to legalize and authorize robbery, murder, and spoliation of weak and helpless people, merely because you want possession of their lands, and the patronage and profitable business of governing them, and you are not even willing to govern them under the limitations and safeguards of that Constitution which has been the bulwark of liberty on this continent. You propose to go into the business of government purely for profit. Your war of "benevolent assimilation" has degenerated into a war of conquest and extermination. The mines, the forests, the fields, and all franchises in the Philippines have tempted you, and the devil of tyranny which has so long slumbered in your bosoms now asserts itself. I speak advisedly and prudently when I speak of these selfish motives which lie back of this cruel war.

As early as August 13, 1898, a Cabinet official cabled to Admiral Dewey that the President desired to know what were the most desirable possessions for us to make in those islands. Here is his cablegram, addressed to Admiral Dewey, Manila:

WASHINGTON, August 13, 1898.

The President desires to receive from you any information you may have of the Philippines; desirability of the several islands; character of the people; coal mines; other mineral deposits; harbors; commercial advantages, in a naval and commercial sense; which would be the most advantageous.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

In reply to this Dewey mentioned the "undeveloped coal mines, mineral deposits, and other advantages" of the island of Luzon, and also called attention to other islands, after which McKinley decided to take them all.

Do you find in that cablegram or its reply anything about the good of the governed? Anything about humanity or civilization? Anything about the spread of constitutional liberty? No! It is a cold proposition of greedy and damnable conquest. More than this, all the shameless proceedings are well illustrated here in this House to-day. The chairman of the committee having this bill in charge, which now increases the Army of the United States to an hundred thousand men at an expense of \$150,000,000 a year to carry on this infamous business of conquering the Philippines, openly confesses that he is himself interested in the business—financially interested; that he is the president of a great land and lumber company lately organized for extensive business in the island of Luzon. Without meaning any disrespect or personal offense to the gentleman from Iowa, who is the president of this Philippine land and lumber company, I mention it only because it illustrates the low standard to which we have fallen.

Here is one leading member of this House operating in the timber lands of Luzon; another prominent member operating in sugar lands in Cuba; another company is now being organized to control the street-car lines in Manila; another one to secure railroad franchises; another one the electric franchises, while the great monopoly, which includes the whole Republican party here, is now seeking to get control of the entire business of government. A monopoly of government means a thousand or more fat salaries for civil officers in addition to the immense list of the Army and the Navy.

Who is it crying out for the blood of the Filipinos because they refuse to submit to these outrages? Is it the ordinary American citizen, wanting a place to build a home for himself and family? No, he would never think of going to the Philippines, where the climate is hostile to the white race, and where the country already has a population of 65 to the square mile, while our country has only 23. Who is it that urges on this campaign of slaughter and extermination? It is the speculator, the franchise grabber, the land grabber, the gambler in other men's rights, the trafficker and trader, who is willing to slaughter a thousand helpless victims in order to build up his own private fortune. Aye, willing to exterminate whole tribes and races of people in order to exploit their lands and resources. Oh, sir, this is a crime against humanity; a curse which future generations will hold you responsible for. A day of retribution is not far distant. Your hypocritical pretenses of patriotism have carried you along so far, but the time of awakening will come.

You say you are giving these people the same privileges and safeguards that Jefferson gave to the people of the Louisiana territory. You know it is a falsehood. You know it is an outrageous falsification of the facts of history. Turn to the third article of the treaty of 1803, by which we acquired possession of the Louisiana territory from France; read those words in that treaty. How do they compare with your absolute refusal—by a party vote—to be governed by the Constitution. You say that Jefferson did not wait for the consent of the Government. You know very well that the people of the Louisiana territory preferred

to be under American government instead of French government. You know that that sentiment was so nearly unanimous that it was taken for granted, without a formal declaration. Furthermore, you know that, with the exception of the Indian tribes, the settlers in that territory belonged to our own race of people and had come mostly from our own States. They were the children of our own Commonwealths.

You know, too, that the colony of New Orleans under French rule was a source of danger, and our country needed possession of it in order to avoid a foreign war, while McKinley purchases distant islands and brings on a foreign war. You also know that the promise of statehood was held out to the inhabitants of the territory, and that now we have fifteen States carved out of it and three more ready to be, while nobody here is willing to admit the Philippines to the privilege of statehood. You know all of these things, and still, with falsehood on your lips and hypocrisy in your hearts, you plead the peaceful acquisition of contiguous territory, settled and to be settled by an homogeneous race for the spread of constitutional liberty and the permanent establishment of peace and happiness on this continent as a sufficient excuse for the war of foreign conquest and the establishment of arbitrary and imperial government over millions of people of an alien race 7,000 miles beyond the sea.

Your hypocrisy will not go unmasked. The thin veil of patriotic pretense will be torn away; the truth must be known. The sacred name of religion can not always be used to shelter the devil's purpose. Thank God, there are still some Christian people in this land—some people who still preserve the essence of Christian teachings. The political freebooters who masquerade as Christian civilizers will some day pave the streets of hell with their sordid souls, and God will raise up a generation of honest men, who will see the truth and be willing to deal justly with their fellow-men, of whatever race.

It may be that we shall first have to learn the unprofitableness of the dangerous business in which we are engaged. We may have to learn that an Army of an hundred thousand men and a Navy of 40,000 can not be supported on nothing; that they can not even be supported on the proceeds of plunder and spoliation of the helpless people we are slaughtering. We may have to learn by hard experience that \$750,000,000 a year—the amount appropriated this year by this Congress—has to be wrung from our own people year after year by the hand of the taxgatherer. We may have to learn that this amount is equal to a tax of \$50 on each family of five people in the United States, or that it is equal to the entire volume of the wheat crop of the United States, or, to put it in a different way, we may have to learn, as the people of Italy and some other parts of Europe have learned, that a blue-coat with a frowning musket on every street corner, with all the other accompaniments and privileges of a governing class, will mean that taxation from 10 to 20 per cent of the valuation of all property must sooner or later eat up every dollar of surplus earnings and drive out of existence the great middle class and leave no career open to our children but that of the soldier or the tenant of the soil of a landed aristocracy. Militarism and landlordism—the plague and the curse of Europe and Asia—stare us in the face.

I say we may have all these things to learn, but I am confident that sooner or later impartial history will render a juster verdict than that which this day registers on this, the most vital question that has confronted this Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I shall submit as a part of my remarks portions of a letter now in my possession, written by a gentleman of eminent position and remarkable ability, who has spent many months in the Philippines and made a more careful investigation of conditions there, and reported them with more independence and accuracy than any writer whose observations have been printed. That he is a close observer and able writer the letter itself bears proof; that he is a man of unimpeachable veracity and integrity I can testify from personal knowledge. The whole letter is in my possession and in the author's own handwriting.

His name is withheld because the letter is written only as a personal letter from one friend to another, and not for publication; and his position, as well as the privacy of the communication, makes it improper for me to make it public.

It is dated "Philippine Islands, December 12, 1900," and after the introductory sentence is as follows:

DEAR JUDGE: \* \* \* I notice by your letter, even the intelligent man that you are, that you are yet talking about our "looking after them (the Filipinos) until they are fitted either to be admitted into the Union or given self-government;" and, of course, you are not to blame for this condition of mind; you are entirely dependent upon the papers and magazines, etc., for material to form your opinions. But let me say to you, Judge, honestly and candidly, if you were dependent on the same sources for your knowledge of the people of the old circuit you reside in you would say the same about them. The class of people that are coming out here and running hurriedly around among these people and writing them up and passing judgment on them would be dead sure to pass the same kind of judgment on the people of J—, W—, I—, and W— counties if they were to find those counties, with the same people they now have, situated in some other country of the world, and a large majority of them would decide that they are incapable of



self-government if they were to go and visit them where they are and without ability to speak their language.

We, of course, have savages and semisavages here—several millions of them—but even a large majority of them are much more capable of casting an intelligent vote than are more than that many cotton-field negroes in the South to-day. But the savages and semisavages live to themselves away off in the forests, and in "frontier regions," and maintain their own governments (as our Indians always did). And besides them there are the people over here—the people of the country—the Tagalos and Visayans; and I should say the Tagalos and Visayans include people called, locally, by other names, just as some of our people are called Alabamians and some Virginians and some Vermonters; and there is not any more difference between those of the different names in the Visayan class and the Tagalo class, respectively, here than there is between those I have mentioned there in the United States, either in language or anything else. The Tagalos and Visayans have different languages, but they are very similar; something like high Dutch and "low Dutch," for instance, I imagine. All Tagalos coming in contact with Visayans learn their language almost at once, and vice versa. And you probably think their languages are languages of savages, or, at most, semicivilized people. You probably do not know that each has its history, literature, poetry, etc., and hundreds, in fact, thousands of schools (if we include private schools and classes, etc.).

At the Visayan College, at Cebu, over 400 young men are being educated, and when I visited there last spring four of them were studying Spanish as one of the modern languages they thought it profitable to learn. The rest, of course, were studying in Visayan just as people in our schools study in the English language. Cebu is the city in which the Spanish Catholics established their first church and school over here—in about 1521, about three hundred and seventy-nine years ago—and they have had churches and schools there ever since, and still have them. But the "savages" still stick to their own schools and language and literature, etc., that they had when the Spanish found them here in 1521. And practically the same thing can be said of the Tagalos, but probably a greater per cent of the Tagalos learned Spanish. \* \* \*

Now, of the Tagalos and Visayans there are about 6,000,000, and they are lawyers, doctors, druggists, merchants, artists, artisans, farmers, bankers, etc., just the same as the people called Virginians are, and they live at home in families just the same as Virginians do.

Now, Judge, I am not afraid that you will misunderstand me, but a casual reader of the nonthinking class would come to the conclusion from what I have written above that I claim that these people are just like Virginians, and the equal of Virginians; and would "pitch into" me at once and contradict me, up and down, and call me a fool, and if I were to answer their assertions and contentions, etc., I would have to admit that these people are not white, and that they (at least a great many of them) "go barefooted," and that they dress so as to look to me and you and my critic like "guys," and that they can't talk so as to express an intelligent thought to an American of ordinary education, who does not know their language, and that their principal diet is rice, and that it is very common for them to sit on the floor in a circle when eating their meals, instead of on chairs at tables, as we do; and that if you meet one in the street riding in his buggy or other vehicle he will turn to the left instead of to the right, and if one of them motions with his hand to another to indicate to him that he wants him to come to him he will do it with the ends of his fingers pointing down, etc.

\* \* \* That is, they belong to a different civilization, and thousands of years of character building and civilization, construction on lines essentially different from the lines of our civilization, have made them a different people from us; but that is not saying that they are better than we are, or as good; but most fools think that it is a conclusive proof that they are not as good as we are and that God has made us His agent—"humble instrument" they hypocritically express it—to make them perfect by making them just like us.

The long and short of the whole matter is that they are to-day as capable of self-government as we are. I do not mean by that that they have the capacity to "give" us a good government. (And if they were admitted to be a thousand times as capable to govern us as we are to govern ourselves, we would say that they had no right to "give" us a good government or any other kind.) They could not "give" us as good a government as we can make and maintain ourselves, and quite likely they could not "give" us as good a government as we could "give" them, and I do not think that they can govern themselves as well as we can govern ourselves; that is, their government (if they governed themselves) would probably not be equal to what our government of ourselves at home is; at least it would not be as good in our estimation according to our views of such things. But none of these things touch the matter of self-government.

There is no question at all in the mind of any intelligent person who has had an opportunity to study things here on the ground and has done so, but that these people are capable of self-government, and a thousand times more capable to govern themselves than we are to govern them. We are simply not capable of governing them at all. We can not understand them nor they us. We can govern the people of Canada, or of England, or Germany, or Denmark, or Norway, or Sweden, or we could cut off the States of New York, Kentucky, and California and make provinces of them and govern them. We could do these things because it is possible for us to understand all these peoples. They belong to the same civilization with us. We know that we could cut off States this way and govern them, because we have done it. You remember the reconstruction days. The South was governed that way then, and a great many people who think that God has appointed McKinley as His agent to kill off a portion of these people over here and govern the rest, think (and say) that the Southern States ought to be governed that way yet. I have heard it said a number of times within the last year.

A good many officers over here have concluded that these people are not capable of being governed by Americans—which, as above indicated, I also think is true—and, having come to this conclusion, these officers think that we should change the war into a war of extermination, and wipe them clear off of the face of the earth. You would be surprised at the number of officers in the islands who think the Americans should show no quarter, but should kill men, women, and children, and burn houses without limit, and that the sooner we wipe out the whole race the better. And you would also be surprised to know of the amount of the work of that character that has really been done and is yet being done. \* \* \*

\* \* \* We know that these people can govern themselves, because they have done so. The Aguinaldo governments stood for a year and a half in a majority of the provinces, cities, pueblos, etc., and for two years in some of them, before they were destroyed by the advance of our army; and they were entirely successful, whenever I have been able to learn the facts. Under the Aguinaldo government they had, or rather that government included, governments corresponding in a sense to our State, county, and city governments, etc.; and those, or at least the most of them, have been destroyed by our people; and in only a very few cases have we replaced them with anything.

Along the northern and eastern coast of the island of Mindanao they had three provinces, where they had in successful operation all the machinery of government, courts, administrative offices, and ministerial officers—everything to meet the wants of a civilized people or community. And this state

of things continued for two years. At the end of that time we got possession there, and at once shut everything down tight, and so it stands, and has stood for nine months, with no visible indication whatever that it will ever be different. Nobody is authorized to make a conveyance; there is no way to protest a note; no possibility of trying any kind of a civil case whatever; no sort of means of administering an estate—nothing, absolutely nothing, to enable the people to attend to the affairs of ordinary civilized life.

And that is not the worst of it. In nearly all cases in these islands the Americans in charge do not know that these things are lacking. It is astounding to see the ignorance of such things among Americans. They do not know that these things are lacking, because they do not know of the things themselves and their uses. Nearly all the Army officers think if you sweep the streets of the towns and make people keep the pigpens away from their houses the people are well governed. The only thing they know of government is bossing, or at best, commanding them. Not one in a thousand has any just conception of government.

No, Judge, these people are now ready for self-government, but will never be capable of being satisfactorily governed by people of the Western civilization. And for the same reason there will never be a time when it would be safe to admit them as States into our Union. \* \* \* And it is also true that we can not govern them as a foreign and subject people without so stultifying ourselves in the matter of our professions of principles of all true government as to endanger our own Government in the course of time. And we can not govern them as well as they can govern themselves. And why do we want to govern them at all? \* \* \* It has always been the policy and practice of the English to represent to the world that the people it is profitable to rob and destroy are ignorant and vicious savages who amount to national nuisances, and a curse to the world, etc., and our nation have evidently made up their minds to adopt that policy and practice—or at least those who "run things" and "do things" have—and therefore it would not be popular to tell the truth about the Filipinos. I could write a book that would be interesting, and that would possibly sell, if I could get my own consent to join the procession, and write about the odd and curious things over here, and so exaggerate these as to make the whole work amount to a tissue of lies. I have not seen anything in print that was other than this, in the form of books, speeches, etc. \* \* \* And official reports have lied for purposes had in view.

Future generations will read in the school histories that we, at this day and time, were either vicious or criminally ignorant. \* \* \* And after all, Judge, what do we want these islands for? Hypocritical cant among a certain class says we want to Christianize and properly civilize these people—they say we want to elevate them without using a halter. But that, of course, is the veriest bosh. A few religious cranks, who are entirely ignorant of the situation, may really think this, but of course no one pays any attention to them, because all sensible people know that that is not it. And then again others have been made to believe that God forced them onto us—that circumstances that our people could not control placed them in our hands. \* \* \* etc. \* \* \* We got them on our hands because we wanted them, and worked to get them there; and it took lots of hard work and scheming, too. And it was not all honest or creditable. \* \* \* Of course, some investors of capital will probably make money out of it. In fact, Army contractors and shipowners have already done so.

But for the common run of American people there is absolutely nothing in it. \* \* \* Nor will the islands serve as an outlet for Americans; furnish homes for people. In the first place, the islands already have more people to the square mile than the United States has, and, besides, they are more mountainous than the Rocky Mountain region of the United States is. That is, not a greater per cent of them is inhabitable by man than there is of the Rocky Mountain region of the United States. In short, they (the habitable portions of them) are much worse overcrowded now by the people that are here than the worst overcrowded State of the Union is by the people there. And white people simply will not live in this latitude. They never have done so in any age of the world, and why will people persist in such nonsense as to suppose that they will do so now or hereafter. I know a great many think that Hongkong is a community of white people, and that there are white people at Shanghai and Singapore, and Penang and Molucca and Java and Sumatra and Sandockan, but they think this because they have not read the authorities.

They only have to read the books of the English to see that the English and Dutch colonies in the Tropics are not colonies at all; they are simply Governments by English and Dutch people of tropical peoples. None of these so-called colonies have white people permanently settled in them, or in them at all, except such as are connected with the army or the government, or acting as agents for commercial companies at home.

In short, the English and Dutch have not migrated to these "colonies" here in the Tropics, notwithstanding they (the colonies) have been maintained for centuries, some of them three centuries. And there are to-day almost no Spanish people at all in the Philippines, and there never have been any except what were connected with the army or the government. Spaniards have never migrated here.

And Americans who produce things could not come here and enter into competition with these people as producers. It is conceded by all that these people can do everything here (except govern their country) better and cheaper than Americans can.

But it is poorly worth while for me to try to give you, in a letter, any idea of the "Philippine situation." It involves too much, and as you say "the Philippine problem will not be settled for a long time." It could be. We could settle it in a year, if we should say to the people to-day "we will treat you as we promised to treat the Cubans." No Filipino asks more; and mighty few of them will ever accept less, either willingly or unwillingly. They talk about the war being over. There is more fighting going on to-day than there has been at any time since the first part, or what may be termed the beginning, of the war; and we have fewer real friends in the islands than we ever had before, and each day sees the number diminish.

Our great misfortune has been in the "caliber" of the men that have been in charge over here, Otis and his outfit of incompetents. There has never been a time when they, in the slightest degree, comprehended any part of the situation here. One thing was that they thought that all they had to do was to whip a Filipino army. It never occurred to them that in doing so they would stir up a Filipino people that would have to be conquered; and they are a people that are practically unconquerable. The main reason that they are practically unconquerable is that their conditions of life are such, and their view of death and small regard for it so peculiar, that the things that would unquestionably conquer any people of the civilization that we understand have practically no effect on them at all. In fact, what would conquer an American people (such as what caused the surrender of the South, for example) only renders them desperate, and sets them to fighting in cold earnest, and without parading themselves and their feats, etc.—only settles them down to the real purpose of hurting their enemy. I have no doubt that we will suppress them some day, and will probably do it three or four times within the next dozen years or so, but we will finally give up the islands. They will show themselves to be unprofitable to our people, and become burdensome to our Government, and we will give them up.

There are three classes of people here—the Mohammedan Malays, called



Moros, the pagan Malays, and the Christian Malays. They are all Malays. It's all folderol to blow around about our having an unknown kind of people to deal with—I mean a people that the world never knew of before. They are simply Malays—a people that have always been known, and always been known to belong to the Oriental civilization, and to be incapable of adopting or accepting and adapting themselves to the Western civilization. The European nations have been controlling more or less of the Malay race right here in this immediate vicinity ever since they (the European nations) became powerful enough to come here and rob them and live off of them. And with them it has long been known and settled that there is no use to try to make "white people" out of them, and that the less they are governed the better off both they and their masters are, and therefore the European nations content themselves with just a little government of them as will enable them to tax them and otherwise get money out of them. They are like a certain distinguished American. They claim to be an instrument of God appointed to do that much.

\*\*\* It is, as I said before, simply astounding to see the density, and volume, and weight, and height, and breadth, and depth, and force of the ignorance of civil government affairs that fills the hide of the average Army officer. And it is not confined to officers of low rank. In fact, Otis is a shining example. For instance, he issued general provisions for establishing provincial, and city, and town governments, and all the governments established by the Americans have been established under them. His provisions describe in detail what the governments shall consist of, and how they shall be established, and in the whole scheme courts are not mentioned or referred to, nor is any other sort of judicial body provided for. There is no provision made for any means of trying cases, except, of course, that the Army has a provost court, and it has criminal jurisdiction only. Nor is any provision made for the execution of deeds or wills, or other instruments that need to be proved by official certificate of acknowledgment, etc. Yet the Spanish law is declared (by Otis) to be the law of the land, and it prescribes that deeds and wills and all other instruments shall be executed in a particular manner; and the scheme of government does not provide for the officer—a notary—that can perform the necessary acts, or give power to any other officer to do so. Some notaries have been appointed in Manila, but it was done in response to urgent petitioning of the localities that needed them; and a few courts have been established in the same way.

The point that I am making is that so little is known about civil government among the authorities that they do not know that a judiciary is absolutely necessary to complete any system. Nothing but executive and ministerial officers ever occurs to them—somebody to boss and command, as in the army. \*\*\* The Aguinaldo governments of provinces and towns, etc., torn down by us were a great improvement in form and constituent parts, etc., over the Spanish governments that I do describe. In fact, they are an excellent form of municipal government for a country where the Spanish laws are in force; and it was a disgrace for them to be destroyed by Americans, a liberty-loving (?) people. In my opinion it will be many a day before these people have as good a government over them again—one that will be as satisfactory to them and do them as much good. This was one framed and established by themselves, and they were pleased with it and thought it a good one. And it was a good one. It was effective, and furnished a means for the people to attend to all affairs among themselves that governments are established and maintained for among civilized peoples. And there was actually a state of peace and order in each and every one of their provinces so established from the time they got rid of the Spanish till the day our troops would enter the province; and this was, in some cases, quite a good deal over two years.

\*\*\* The American people have evidently made up their minds to ignore all our old-time principles of, or in regard to, the honest and moral and true doctrine of governments among men and human rights in general. They want to rob these people over here now. That is, they think that these people have money and lands, and other things of value, and will produce more wealth in the future, and we want what they have and will have, or as much of it as we can get; and as these old principles and doctrines are in our way to prevent us from taking it at will, we have made up our minds to set them aside and shut our eyes to them. \*\*\* Not one man in a thousand in the United States wants to know the truth about things over here. If they were told the truth, and they knew what they were told was true, they would not allow themselves to believe it. They have made up their minds as to what they are going to do, and they are going to do it; and what is more, they are not going to allow themselves to believe anything that would make it very wrong for them to do it. \*\*\* In my opinion, there is a day coming when this whole scheme and the policy back of it will be condemned by the whole world, and especially by the American people; and the time will begin to approach rapidly as soon as the people become convinced that there is no money in it for them, and that it is expensive to them besides. \*\*\*

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COONEY].

Mr. COONEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress, composed practically of the same men now sitting in its two branches, did on the 18th day of April, 1898, pass the following resolution:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Approved April 20, 1898.

After three years the Republican party now presents its scheme for entering upon the fulfillment of our promise to depart from Cuba, and "leave the government and control of the island to its people." Here is the scheme, attached to the Army bill, and to be forced to passage this afternoon.

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled, "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to

carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

# I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

# II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government shall be inadequate.

# III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

# IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

# V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

# VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

# VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coal-ing or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

# VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

No one knows better than Republicans that this is a scheme to remain and not to depart from Cuba; no one knows better that the demands now made on Cuba is a shallow scheme by which the solemn vow made by the American people over the sacred relics of the ill-fated *Maine* is to be broken, and the most infamous national perfidy is to be committed. Let it be known that these demands upon Cuba's liberty are not made at this time by Congress voluntarily. It has ceased to have a voluntary action. It has sunk to that state of pusillanimity that it now strikes Cuba at the behest of McKinley and a promise of a long vacation.

The story of Cuba is told. No power can save her from the thieves that now hold her by the throat. Spain is dead, but her spirit and her religion, which were her greed and her despotism, have survived and conquered. Her blood in spilling was diffused through Anglo-Saxon veins; the ghosts of her Cortez and Pizarro are re-animated and walk these halls, and the spirit of her Philip dwells in the White House. For years to come we shall boast our honor and glory through press and pulpit, but we shall wait in vain for a single act of the Administration that will distinguish us from the most sordid of nations.

## THE PHILIPPINES.

At the last session of Congress the Spooner bill was introduced in the Senate. Its object was to complete the colonial scheme of the Republican party in the Philippines by turning over the future government and control of the islands to the President. It is now attached to this bill, and adds its weight to a measure already burdened with infamy. Knowing it to be unconstitutional, the most conscienceless Republicans are put forward to claim for it a paternity from Thomas Jefferson.

On the 20th of February the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in referring to the manner in which President Jefferson undertook the administration of the Louisiana Territory, said:

And the very language of the law under which Mr. Jefferson took possession of that Territory is to-day embodied almost verbatim in the Spooner bill.

The advocates of the Spooner bill for some time past, both in Congress and through the public print, have been attempting to impress the public mind with the belief that it had good authority and precedent for its passage at this time in the action of the Democratic party in the past; that in its language and the powers conferred the Spooner bill is identical with the law passed by a Democratic Congress in 1803 for the administration of the affairs of the Louisiana territory. Nothing can be further from the truth. I will read both the law of 1803 and the Spooner bill, that they may go into the RECORD together and be judged as to their identity and difference.



## LOUISIANA BILL OF 1803.

Until the expiration of the present session of Congress, or unless provision be sooner made for the temporary government of the said territories, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the full enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

## PHILIPPINE BILL OF 1901.

When all insurrection \* \* \* shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

The law and the bill are as far apart as the poles. But, clearer than any party platform can make it, they mark and illustrate the difference in action and principle of the two parties. The Louisiana purchase and its inhabitants were never cursed with the badge of servitude and plunder that is promised the Philippines by the Spooner bill.

The Jefferson law was for temporary government; this Spooner bill is for permanent government. The powers conferred by the Jefferson law were to absolutely terminate with the end of the session of Congress that passed the law; those proposed to be conferred by the Spooner bill are to continue without any limitations as to time. The Jefferson law contemplated immediate legislation for the government of the Louisiana territory by Congress itself; this Spooner bill contemplates that there shall be no legislation for the government of the Philippines by Congress.

The Jefferson law gave authority to the President only to administer such government as he found already existing; this Spooner bill gives authority to the President to overthrow any government existing in the Philippines and to establish any government he pleases. If Republicans believe that the Spooner bill is identical with the Jefferson law, let them substitute the latter for the former, and every Democrat will vote for it as cheerfully as Democrats voted for it one hundred years ago.

The Constitution ordained:

All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, and shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I thought that this was that Congress; but the President has set up a commission in the Philippines, and has made of it his ideal of what a Congress should be. Through that congress he has been legislating and experimenting in civil government for the past two years.

He has claimed this power as Executive of the nation, and he has repeatedly declared that by the exercise of that power he was fast bringing the islands to a condition of peace, protecting life and property, and extending municipal and civil government as fast and as far as the Army extended the sphere of its subjugation. If that is a fact, why not let the President continue his good work under powers that he has declared to be ample and sufficient for the purpose? Why should he now for the first time appeal from his rump congress in Manila to his possum policy Congress here in Washington for a further grant of power? The reasons and inducements for that appeal are to be found in the recent report of the Taft commission made to the President. I will read some of them from that report. A dispatch from the commission to the Administration:

If you approve, ask transmission to proper Senators and Representatives of following: Passage of Spooner bill at present session greatly needed to secure best result from improving conditions. Until its passage no purely central civil government can be established, no public franchises of any kind granted, and no substantial investment of private capital in internal improvements possible. \* \* \*

Sale of public lands and allowance of mining claims impossible until Spooner bill. Hundreds of American miners on ground waiting law to protect claim. More coming. Good element in pacification. Urgently recommend amendment of Spooner bill so that its operation be not postponed until complete suppression of all insurrection.

This report further shows that there are 73,000,000 acres of land in the islands; that scarcely 5,000,000 of them are held in private ownership, and the balance, which is practically all of the islands, are public lands to be disposed of; that these lands are very fertile and most of them naturally irrigated; that there are large forests of the finest timbers, extensive deposits of gold, copper, high-grade iron, and excellent coal, and that there are over a thousand foreign capitalists, promoters, prospectors, and their agents on the ground anxiously waiting for the passage of the Spooner bill that they may make a rush and secure titles to those lands, forests, and minerals. The Spooner bill was misnamed; it should be called "the Sooner bill."

Within the covers of this report there is not another single reason given for the passage of the Spooner bill. That bill does not add one iota to the power that the President now has and exercises that will aid him in the prosecution of the war nor in the establishment of such government as will bring peace and tranquillity to the islands. The bill is nothing more and nothing less than a patent deed conveying to President McKinley the title to the islands and their inhabitants.

I do not care how good a man he is, the islands are not his. He is not the lawful owner of them. They belong to the people. I shall never place the seal of my vote to that conveyance. I am for holding on to the islands. You know, for you have said it repeatedly, that these islands came to us through the hazards of war; that Providence placed them in our hands as a sacred trust; and I am opposed to conveying or transferring them to any prince, power, or potentate, either foreign or domestic.

If the President will return to us the \$20,000,000 we paid for them, and the \$300,000,000 we have spent upon them, and the 10,000 American lives we have sacrificed in them, then I will be in favor of the Spooner bill and willing to transfer the whole archipelago over to President McKinley, washing our hands of the whole business.

It is remarkable that a President of the United States should ask the passage of any law like the Spooner bill; that he should seek to clothe himself with power so great and responsibility so small. Here are franchises and rights and lands and minerals to be given away by the Spooner bill. The commission in this report says there is just enough peace for the President to dispose of all of them and just a little too much war for Congress to exercise its powers of legislation on the subject. And the evidence is that the commission is ready, willing, and able to maintain just that condition of affairs in the islands as long as the President desires it and as long as there is anything left worth giving away.

A remarkable thing contained in this report is the demand of the commission and the greedy vultures assembled in the islands that the Spooner bill be passed now, and not to wait until the war is over. They recognize that if they are compelled to wait until the war is over their chance for plunder will be diminished.

Sir, this is one part of this Philippine business the settlement of which Congress can not pass to the President or other hands without dishonoring itself and subjecting its members to the charge of having shared in the wild orgies of plunder that would inevitably follow. The title to the lands in those islands should be preserved for their own people, to be by them obtained under happier conditions than now exist there, and under laws and rules that are clearly defined and justly made by Congress.

Neither under American nor Spanish rule have these people ever had the opportunity to acquire peaceable and permanent titles to anything in their own country, and it will be inhuman and monstrous to undertake to dispose of everything of value in the islands in the very midst of war, when even those who are friendly to our Government will be prevented by the prevailing excitement, fear, and lack of information from taking advantage of such an opportunity.

It is true that the Spooner bill as amended and attached to this bill in the Senate is shorn of the power to dispose of the lands in the Philippines, but everyone knows that another Congress will restore that power. That is the power McKinley has asked and demanded, and he will have it. We are now passing a law which absolutely transfers to him the sole government and legislation of the Philippines. It can only be taken away from him by the enactment of another law, and as he has the vetoing of any such a measure, it will be absolutely impossible for this or subsequent Congresses to take that power away from him.

Legislation on the lands, mines, rights, and franchises will in the meantime become necessary for the progress of the islands. Who is to do that legislation? We can yet answer, "Congress;" but when an hour shall have passed, and the roll shall have been called, and the last Republican shall have come forward, mean spirited, guilty looking, and abdicates the proud position of an American Representative, while he hangs on to its emoluments, then there will be no power left to wrench that prerogative from McKinley nor to prevent him from giving the islands over to be sacked by his personal friends.

Nor all that heralds rake from coffin'd clay,  
Nor florid prose, nor homed lies of rhyme,  
Can blazon evil deeds, or consecrate this crime.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, of course in the time which has been allowed us by the majority of this House it is impossible for any member to discuss this measure on its merits. We can only enter our protest, and that I solemnly do. It seems that gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber can only defend this measure by citing Democratic precedents which they themselves say they do not believe in. They are not willing even to accept the precedents which they cite.

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when these gentlemen will regret that they have muzzled the representatives of the people upon this floor on questions which are the most important which have been debated in this House for many, many years; and they will repent the haste with which they are hurrying through this House a bill dealing with policies which involve the future fortunes of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan



[Mr. CORLISS], with unusual frankness, has helped to clear the atmosphere of this debate. He says that under the stress of excitement in the early days of the Spanish war he voted to give to the people of Cuba the right to govern themselves. But now that his mind has recovered its usual calm—and now, being inspired, no doubt, by a knowledge of the fact that the lands of Cuba are fertile and opportunities to exploit the island abundant—he repents that decent and honest vote and hopes that the troops of the United States will not be withdrawn and that our sacred pledge will not be kept. He frankly speaks what is in the minds of the majority of his political associates.

The language of that resolution is so plain that the wayfarer, though a fool, can not fail to understand it. There are two very conspicuous features of the resolution to which, for a moment, I wish to invite your attention. The opening sentence declares that "the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

It does not say that they shall be semi-independent or in a state of vassalage, but that they shall be independent. Now what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It does not mean that Cuba shall be to the United States what India is to England or Java to the Netherlands. To be a free and independent nation is to occupy, in respect to other nations, the same relative position that Russia has to Germany or France to England.

In some countries the hand of tyranny presses less harshly than in others. But there are no gradations in liberty. Either the people of a country are free or they are not free.

We declared that the people of Cuba were free, unconditionally free. That resolution was an honor to the Congress which passed it, and God forbid that we should now dishonor it as these new resolutions propose to do, and as I fear we are about to do. We wrote one chapter of shame into the history of our country when we betrayed a trusting people and repudiated an ally. We are now about to repeat in Cuba the shameful and despotic thing which we did in the Philippines. And what did those resolutions say about our duty and our programme in Cuba?

It declared—

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Do you remember how the nations of Europe sneered when we passed that resolution?

Do you not remember that they, with a frankness which bordered on rudeness, said that we were lying, and that behind our high-sounding phrases there lurked a lust for land and gold which would keep the American soldier in the Philippines and the West Indies? And the pity of it is that their sneers were founded in a knowledge of the situation.

Is it not preposterous to say that we are living up to either the spirit or the letter of those resolutions?

We specifically disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control in Cuba.

Now, among the inherent rights of sovereignty is that of making treaties. By the resolution attached to this Army appropriation bill we deny that right to Cuba. Another of the attributes of sovereignty is the right of any people to control their own schemes of taxation and expenditures. Here again we propose to cheat the Cubans of the essence of independence. These new resolutions, only a degree less infamous than our behavior in the Philippines, set up a new territorial claim, Mr. Speaker.

There is not a schoolboy in the country who has studied the geography of the West Indies who does not know that the Isle of Pines is as much a part of Cuba as the island of Galveston is a part of the State of Texas. And yet we seek now, with dishonest cunning which is a disgrace to the country, to set up a claim to the Isle of Pines. Step by step in this career of despotism and dishonesty we are justifying the sneers of Europe. It seems that no promise is so sacred, no pledge so solemn, that it may not be broken.

Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Have the American people lost all sympathy with liberty? Do they no longer revere the precepts of the Revolutionary days? Alas! sir, it is due to greed. The love of money, which is the root of all evil, has chilled the blood of our people and dulled their sense of honor. Commercialism has taken the place of patriotism, and when any new scheme is proposed, no one asks, "Is it right; will it reflect credit upon our country; will it promote human liberty and human happiness?" but, "Will it pay?"

We denied an alliance and destroyed a republic in the Philippines because the forests of those unhappy islands contain valuable timbers and their mountains are reputed to hide gold. We now repudiate a solemn covenant with God and the world and will take and retain Cuba because in her pleasant valleys our capitalists can grow the most fragrant tobacco in the world and secure the extravagant returns from sugar plantations. Quite recently the Taft Commission gave as one of the reasons why

civil government should be promptly established in the Philippines the desire to gratify the demand for franchises.

With the Republican party the opportunity to grant a franchise is esteemed a higher privilege than the chance to set up a free government or to promote liberty.

Should it ever be called upon to write a new Bill of Rights that party will, I do not doubt, forget the existence of men as men, and devote itself to the guardianship of the rights of corporations. Unless it may be considered already to have a de facto corporate existence, it should, by all means, go to New Jersey and have its syndicated, dividend-hunting, liberty-crushing nature formally recognized.

The Army has ever been the instrument of despotism. It is fitting, then, that this assault upon the rights of the Cubans should come as it has in the way of an amendment to the Army appropriation bill. The association is suggestive. I print now the Teller resolution.

[Public resolution—No. 21.]

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with 236 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people. Approved, April 20, 1898.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER].

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Speaker, let the country take notice that the Republican majority here in Congress has deprived the Democracy of the opportunity of properly discussing this question, which is attracting public attention all over the country.

Being deprived of the privilege of showing how at variance this bill is with our promise to the Cubans, I content myself with placing before the House and the country the advance sentiment of Republicanism in a Republican legislature in a Republican State, as embodied in the following resolutions, which I clipped from the North American, a Republican paper in another Republican State. These resolutions show the trend of public sentiment even in Republican circles. I hope no Democrat on this side will take offense to my reading these resolutions:

TOPEKA, KANS., February 24.

Senator Thomas Nottseger and F. Dumont Smith, Republican floor leaders, have drafted the concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the legislature. The resolution will be introduced to-morrow.

It is very unique, and doubtless its wording will be strongly objected to by the Democrats and Populists in the legislature. However, the Republican majority in both branches is very large, and it will be adopted. The resolution follows:

"Whereas William I, formerly William McKinley, is to be crowned as emperor of the United States of America, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, king of the Philippine Islands and Alaska, protector of the Ladrões, and prince of Guam on Monday, March 4, 1901; and

"Whereas this nation will cease to be a republic on said date, and will become a military despotism; and

"Whereas a legislature elected by the people has no part, place, function, or office under said empire: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein)*, That this legislature shall conclude its business, wind up its affairs, and adjourn sine die before noon of said March 4, 1901; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we assure His Most Gracious Majesty hereby that all acts and resolutions of this legislature are subject to his royal will to approve or set aside, as to him seemeth best, and we, his loyal subjects, do hereby desire to testify our loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty William I."

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY].

Mr. OTEY, after addressing the Chair, stood silent for several moments and looking at his watch, and then said: My time has expired. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, destructive though this measure may be to Philippine freedom, threatening though



the hour of its passage may be to Cuban independence, menacing though it be to the constitutional rights and liberties of the free men of the United States, a bright lining appears on the ominous dark cloud, for the enactment of these amendments so hurriedly grafted upon this appropriation measure marks the rejuvenation of a united, aggressive, and a triumphant Democratic party.

Within its organization will be welcomed all our citizens who believe in maintaining in its integrity the Government which came down to us from the fathers of the Republic, and under which we have reached the high-water mark of progress, reputation, and material development.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I feel duly grateful for the courtesy shown me by the House in according me a portion of the brief time allotted for the discussion of this bill, and will avail myself of this final opportunity to pay my respects to the Administration and the political issues it has engendered. This is the closing day of the Fifty-sixth Congress, which will go into history famous for the good it has avoided and the evil it has accomplished. It has been my fortune, good or bad, to participate in a negative way in all that has been done, and after resuming my part I can truthfully say that I have cast no vote which I feel ashamed of or for which I have been called upon to apologize. I have protested by speech and vote against the objectionable legislation which has been enacted, but I have found the majority at all times merciless in their intolerance, heedless of our warnings, and deaf to our protests.

Responsibility is largely measured by opportunity, and with its limited opportunities and the utter helplessness of the minority under the arbitrary rules of the House more could not be expected of this side of the Chamber or of a new member, and in taking my leave of this body after so brief a service I am reminded of the inscription on the gravestone of the 6-weeks-old infant:

I was so quickly done for,  
I wonder what I was begun for.

It seems to me that this would be an opportune time to review some of the issues of the late campaign and see whether or not all that we predicted has not been confirmed. Three great issues were presented representing cardinal principles of the Democratic party. We denounced the single gold standard and proclaimed our allegiance to the ancient and righteous principle of bimetalism. We arraigned the trusts and charged the Republican party with being in league with them, pledged to afford the people no remedy against their rapacity.

We warned the public against the dangers of imperialism, so manifest in the policy of the Administration relative to Cuba and the Philippines and lurking in the very shadow of the Republican platform. These questions have not been settled, but are living issues, and, like Banquo's ghost, will come up to haunt the Republican party in the future. The country, basking in the sunshine of general prosperity, which came inevitably in the course of things, not by reason of the Republican Administration, but in spite of it, was loth to disturb existing conditions, was content to let well enough alone, and assumed the risk of arresting in the future the tendency toward imperialism rather than run the risk of unsettling business conditions, which always attends as an incident to the change of Administrations.

Do not deceive yourselves, my friends, the people have not approved your policy of imperialism, and when that question shall be fairly presented, unhampered and uncomplicated by individual necessity and temporary expediency, the voice of the American people will be heard in one triumphant acclaim against the infamous policy which you have so assiduously endeavored to fasten upon the country. The theory of bimetalism has been vindicated by events, which may be misleading now, but which will be fully understood and appreciated in the future. Bimetalism means more standard, more basic money, the necessity of which was admitted prior to the phenomenal increase in the production of gold in Alaska, which, in the light of history, can be only temporary. This increase in the output of gold has supplied the place of silver for the time being and brought relief and prosperity to the country.

The production of gold last year was more than double that of both gold and silver in 1896, when the money question so intensely challenged the attention of the world. Let us hope that this enormous output will indefinitely continue, but if not, beware of silver's demand for restoration as standard money. Good times and bad times alternate as day and night, as sunshine and shadow, as the hill and the valley. We are now enjoying the high tide of day, the sunshine upon the hill crest; but as we scan the horizon we see the ominous gathering of financial clouds and hear the awful rumbling of a commercial storm. I have often heard it predicted of late that the strenuous commercial conditions prevailing throughout this country at no late day will reach a climax and culminate in the most distressing and far-reaching panic the

world has ever known. I pray that this cup may pass, but unless something is done soon to curb the avarice and the rapacity of commercial greed we will awake some day to find our worst hopes realized and our country in the throes of chaos and anarchy.

I am no pessimist; I am an optimist; and trusting and believing in the wisdom, the intelligence, and the infallibility of the American people, I know a remedy will be found ere it is too late. No hope can be indulged during the incoming Administration. President McKinley and his party are wedded to the commercial interests; are controlled and dominated by those influences, and will continue to foster and encourage them in the future as they have in the past. The trusts will continue to feed and fatten upon the vitals of the people; monopoly will continue to absorb the resources of the country, and commercial cupidity and greed will continue to hold high carnival, enforcing extension, exacting tribute, and demanding subsidy at the hands of a puny Administration and a servile Congress.

What has become of your boasted promises to suppress the trust evil? You have full power—you have the Executive and both branches of Congress—why does not the Senate pass the anti-trust bill which passed this House last session for campaign purposes, as we then charged and you now confess? In a speech upon this floor last May I said the Republican party did not intend to pass any measure designed to suppress the trust evil. I then used this language:

The only excuse and justification claimed for the Philippine war is that it will extend American trade and commerce, all at the instance of the great trusts and monopolies which are sapping the life-blood of our nation—and right here permit me to digress long enough to inquire why no anti-trust legislation has been enacted by this Congress. Why has every bill introduced for the suppression of these gigantic and monstrous evils been suppressed by the majority? I understand you have introduced a constitutional amendment of some kind; but that was done, I venture to say, for the purpose of tiding the question over the Presidential election. You do not intend to legislate against the trusts, and your amendment is only an excuse and a makeshift. You intend to rely upon platform promises rather than performance, when you have the present power and opportunity.

Tell me, has not the prediction I then made been fulfilled? Answer me, was that bill passed for the purposes of the campaign only? Were you in good faith, or were you merely exploiting your pretenses for the purpose of hoodwinking and cajoling the people into voting to continue your reign of plunder and robbery?

Let me call your attention to the fact that both the Democratic and the Republican platforms last campaign declared against the trusts. The Republican platform proposed some vague, uncertain, and indefinite remedy against this evil. I would invite you, gentlemen of both the Democratic and Republican parties, to read the Republican platform and its friendly allusion to the trusts. It does not pain me to say that the Republican platform against trusts is insincere and was not adopted with a view to its enforcement in the case of Mr. McKinley's reelection, and was not intended to commit the leaders in the Republican party to the enforcement of existing anti-trust laws or the enactment of new laws to suppress the trust evil.

Recently when standing upon the platform of a car, the porter came to me and gently tapped me upon the shoulder and said, "Mister, you must not stand upon this platform." I said, "Sir, what is this platform for?" and he replied, "This platform, Mister, is to get in on, sir." I never fully understood the full purport and meaning of that definition of a platform or what a platform was really intended for until I reread the declaration or plank in the Republican platform against trusts, and then I discovered for the first time the full purport and meaning of a political platform, especially a Republican platform, that they are not made to stand on, but made to "get in on."

When Republican spellbinders during the campaign went about the country telling the people they undertook to provide a remedy against the trust evil last session of Congress by a constitutional amendment, and that they were defeated in their project by the Democratic minority, they no doubt deceived many and left the impression that the proposed amendment was necessary, and that the Democratic minority in Congress was hostile to all legislation against the trust evil.

Let me read that amendment, and then point out the objections to it which induced almost the whole of the Democratic minority in Congress to vote against it. Here it is:

Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

I assume that Congress already has ample power and authority to suppress all trusts doing an interstate business and that a constitutional amendment is wholly unnecessary. Trusts are foreign or domestic; that is, those which do a business wholly within the bounds of a single State—the State of their origin—and trusts which do an interstate business. Every State legislature has ample and full power to suppress every local or domestic trust doing business wholly in the State of its origin, and the Federal Congress has no power to interfere with any such trust, monopoly, or combination, and should have none. We desire that the several



States of the Union shall continue to exercise that power; that they shall not be limited or prescribed in the power which they may exercise toward the suppression of all local and domestic trusts, monopolies, and combinations; that no restriction of Congress, that no definition of a trust, that no regulation or control of trusts which Congress may see fit to adopt shall abridge or interfere with the right of the State of Illinois or any other State to protect itself against any local or domestic concern of that character.

I assert that Congress already has ample and sufficient power to protect the several States of the Union against a trust, monopoly, or combination existing or incorporated in another State and to prevent it from doing business outside of the State of its origin, and that a constitutional amendment is wholly unnecessary to afford Federal interference and relief against this evil.

Let me call your attention to the wording of the proposed amendment. It provided that "Congress shall have power to define trusts, monopolies, or combinations." Now, if Congress should have the power to define a trust, it could place upon these combinations in restraint of trade a very liberal or a very strict definition, and, influenced by trust agents and lobbyists, could so define the trust that even the Standard Oil Company would not come within its definition, and every State legislature would be prescribed, limited, and bound by the definition, for by the very terms of the amendment the States could act only in harmony and not in conflict with the law of Congress, thereby depriving the people of any and all remedy by means of State legislation against a most iniquitous evil.

It provides that the States shall not exercise such power—that is, the power to define, to regulate, to control, to prohibit, or to dissolve trusts—except that they do so in compliance with the laws prescribed by Congress. And hence if the Congress should so define a trust as to permit all combinations of capital organized for the purpose of limiting production and arbitrarily fixing prices to continue to do business, the States would be powerless to exercise a remedy against that character of combinations, whether they are domestic or foreign, and would be wholly without a remedy, because the States would be limited to the remedy afforded the people by the definition placed upon trusts by this body. The result would be to abridge the power of the States, to make State legislatures wholly subservient to the will of Congress and subject to the definition placed upon trusts by the Congress, and to deny the people any other remedy than that which Congress would see fit to afford against the trust evil. The only remedy heretofore afforded against trusts has been through the several State legislatures, and we insist that the power to enact and enforce anti-trust laws shall not be abridged or denied to the States, but that the States shall continue to exercise unrestricted power concurrent with Federal authority and not be subject to any limitations or restrictions of Congress.

The Republican party are under obligations to the trusts. They receive contributions for campaign purposes from these unlawful combinations. The Republican party is said to be always true to its friends; true to its obligations. I must confess the Republican party was never known to betray a trust. And they will not be so ungrateful in the next four years to come as to prosecute their best friends, the men who furnish them the money by which they hope to corrupt the ballot box; they will not be so ungrateful to MARK HANNA and his friends as to put a straw in the way of the trusts.

I want to go a step further. I would impress upon your minds that we are involved in complications growing out of the acquisition of the Philippine Islands by reason of the demand made by the trusts, by monopoly, and by commercial greed. The negotiations for the Philippine Islands and their acquisition was demanded by the trusts that they might have a new field to exploit, and insist that the whole people of the United States shall maintain a standing Army; shall be compelled to support the Government in its policy of imperialism and militarism that commercial greed may reap a harvest. By reason of this demand upon the part of the trusts, the Administration, controlled and dominated by MARK HANNA, and men of his character, negotiated for the Philippine Islands and paid \$20,000,000 for their cession to the United States.

I have often been asked the difference between Thomas Jefferson expansion and McKinley imperialism. Let me define the difference. When Thomas Jefferson negotiated for the Louisiana Territory, it embraced the mouth and the whole western bank of the Mississippi River. Mr. Jefferson knew it was safer to acquire the Louisiana Territory that we might avoid foreign complications and future wars. He negotiated for the Louisiana Territory that we might control the Mississippi River, its tributaries, and its mouth. Remember that when we secured all that vast domain known as the Louisiana Territory it was vacant, unoccupied, and practically uninhabited territory. It lay at our very door, inviting the footsteps and the ax of civilization. When we acquired that

territory, Mr. Jefferson required that there should be incorporated in the treaty ceding it to the United States this declaration: "That the future inhabitants of the Louisiana Territory should be citizens of the United States." That was not imperialism. That was not creating colonies. That was not profaning the Constitution, defiling the Declaration of Independence, or prostituting the American flag, but was a wise provision for the extension of the Constitution and the blessings of free government and free institutions to all that vast expanse of vacant territory to be occupied by our own people and to be erected into States of the American Union, extending the blessings of free government from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

Contrast that, if you please, with McKinley imperialism. When we acquired the Philippine Islands they were not necessary to avoid foreign complications or future wars, but were calculated, as results have shown, to involve us in the very character of wars and complications which we sought to avoid, and in fact have avoided, by the Louisiana purchase. They were not contiguous territory, but lay 8,000 miles across the sea. They were not vacant, unoccupied, and uninhabited territory, but were populated more densely than any rural portion of the United States. Populated by a people alien in race, alien in color, alien in religion, alien in tongue, alien in customs and education, alien in all that ought to be common between the citizens of the same republic. But that is not all. Let me impress upon the minds of my Republican friends that the treaty ceding the Philippine Islands to the United States does not provide that the inhabitants shall be citizens of the United States, but it does provide "that the civil rights and political status of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands shall be determined by Congress."

If we keep the Philippine Islands, we must determine in what capacity we will retain them. When Congress determines their civil rights and their political status, it will determine whether they shall be citizens of the United States or whether they shall be subjects. If you make them citizens, you will confer upon them all the constitutional privileges, all the rights and all the blessings of free government which you yourselves enjoy. There can be no distinction between American citizens, whatever their race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Every American citizen is entitled to the same privileges, the same rights, the same immunities under the American flag the world over. You can not discriminate between them. If you make the people of the Philippine Islands citizens, you give to them all the privileges which you and your children possess and enjoy. You must admit the products of those islands free of duty to our markets in competition with the products of the American farm and factory. You must give them representation in the Congress of the United States, that there shall be no taxation without representation. You must give them a voice in the government, that we may not impose upon them a government against their consent, in violation of the plain letter of the Declaration of Independence. You must erect them into States of the American Union. You must admit the brown men of the Philippine Islands into your home, into your political society, into your business affairs with the same rights that you yourselves possess and enjoy. You must tear down the Chinese-exclusion act and admit the pauper labor of the Philippine Islands in competition with the free labor of the United States. Are you now ready—are you prepared—are you willing to make the brown men of the Philippine Islands citizens of the United States?

If you do not make them citizens you must make them subjects. Subjects of a free Republic; denying them the Constitution of the United States; imposing upon them a government without their consent; enforcing the payment of taxes without representation. To make them subjects you must maintain a standing army, that you may enforce your government without consent and taxation without representation at the point of the bayonet.

There are but two kinds of government—government by consent and government by force. Government by force is imperialism. Government against will and sustained by military authority is foreign to the institutions of the United States and in violation of constitutional rights. When Mr. McKinley was first elected President our standing army was but 25,000 men. After the Spanish war had closed, after victory upon sea and land, adding renown and luster to the American Army and Navy; after the volunteer soldier had returned to his peaceful pursuits and when no war was imminent in the Philippine Islands, Mr. McKinley asked Congress to give him authority to increase the standing Army to 100,000 men. Why? That the Republican policy of government by brute force might be extended to the Philippine Islands. That an army might be in readiness to hold these people in subjection. That they might be governed as England sought to govern the thirteen American colonies prior to the American Revolution. Not only that, the trusts and the combinations in the United States demanded an increase in our standing Army that they might feel more secure in the possession and enjoyment of their ill-gotten gains; that a standing army might be stationed at



every industrial center to enforce government by injunction, and to awe and deter and bulldoze union labor and the American workman.

To make them citizens of the United States is to endanger our civilization. To make them subjects endangers our form of government, because it is a departure from the principles which have guided us to prosperity in the years that have passed. Let me call your attention to what ex-President Harrison has said. At the time of the Porto Rico tariff bill discussion in this House, when it was proposed to tax the Porto Ricans without representation, in violation of the Constitution, which requires that taxation shall be uniform throughout the United States, Mr. Harrison said: "I regard it a serious departure from right principles."

I do not stand here appealing in behalf of the brown men of the Philippine Islands. They are a matter of small consequence to you and to me as compared with the future of our country and of posterity. All humanity sympathizes with them, but my heart bleeds for my own country and for my own fellow-citizens. Extend to them a policy such as proposed by Mr. McKinley, a colonial policy after the style of England; impose upon other people a government by force, sustained by the military power; create colonies; recognize government by brute force, and you have taken not only the first but an irretrievable step in the direction of imperialism; not only threatening the liberties of other people, not only depriving the brown men of the Philippine Islands of their rights and of their liberty, but in the end jeopardizing and threatening the liberty, the institutions of our own country. You can not extend despotic power to other people without in the near future the seed you plant returning to curse you at home, and it is for and on behalf of our own country and our own people that I plead against that departure from our form of government under which we have grown prosperous and great.

I am opposed to a large standing army because it begets a spirit of intolerance and of tyranny at home and abroad. I am opposed to maintaining an army of 70,000 men in the Philippines to crush the spirit of liberty and the germs of free government there. The volunteer soldier is a republic's best defender. The mercenary soldier is a machine, while the volunteer soldier fights for a principle and dies for a just cause. I am opposed to a large standing army, not only because it tends to subvert free institutions, but because of the enormous expense entailed. Our Republican friends, drunk upon the lust of empire and imbued with the spirit of conquest and commercial aggrandizement, propose by this bill to maintain an army of 100,000 men at an expense of \$170,000,000 a year. During the last year of Mr. Cleveland's Administration the total cost of our Army was but \$23,000,000 a year, and now it is proposed to appropriate seven times that amount for the ensuing year. We were told during the campaign that Mr. McKinley's election would witness immediate cessation of hostilities in the Philippine Islands. If the war is over, why the necessity of increasing the Army? Why this immense expenditure of money?

I submit the following estimate of the costs of our Army and Navy, including pensions, for the year 1891 as compared with that of Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia:

	Army.	Navy.	Pensions.	Total.
United States, 1901.....	\$170,000,000	\$78,000,000	\$144,000,000	\$392,000,000
Great Britain.....	115,000,000	135,000,000	15,000,000	265,000,000
France.....	127,000,000	57,000,000	26,000,000	210,000,000
Germany.....	127,000,000	15,500,000	15,000,000	157,500,000
Russia.....	147,000,000	34,000,000	19,000,000	200,000,000
United States, 1895.....	23,000,000	25,000,000	151,000,000	199,000,000

Let me warn our Republican friends against the extravagance in public expenditures which has characterized the McKinley Administration. Whatever may be the fundamental issues in the next general election, whether it be bimetallism, trusts, or imperialism, one you must meet will be willful extravagance and corruption. The watchword of 1904 will be "retrenchment and reform."

Let me contrast the expenditures of the Cleveland Administration with that of the McKinley Administration. I would invite your attention to these figures:

Year.	Amount.	Per cent.
1893.....	\$383,477,954.40	5.78
1894.....	367,525,279.83	5.43
1895.....	356,195,298.29	5.16
1896.....	352,179,446.08	5.01
1897.....	365,774,159.57	5.11
1898.....	443,368,582.80	6.97
1899.....	605,072,179.85	8.14
1900.....	487,713,791.71	6.39
1900-1902 (estimated).....	1,500,000,000.00	20

For the purpose of avoiding an extra session the Senate has seen fit to extend certain powers to the President in relation to the Cuban situation which are greater than that exercised by any sovereign upon the earth, and yet we are told that imperialism is a myth and a fraud.

I am opposed to this bill not only because it begets a spirit of intolerance and tyranny; not only because of enormous expense of maintaining a large standing army; not only because it may and will be used as an engine of oppression in the Philippine Islands, but because it is a violation of the solemn pledge given Cuba and the world in the following resolution of Congress when war was declared against Spain. I will read it:

That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent, and that the Government of the United States hereby recognizes the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of that island, \* \* \* hereby disclaiming any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

By this bill the United States seeks to exercise sovereignty and jurisdiction over the island of Cuba and absolute control of its foreign relations. The sacred words of that resolution, borrowed from the Declaration of Independence, are no guaranty against its violation by the Republican party, and the country is about to witness another act of perfidy on the part of Congress by the passage of this bill that will go far to convince the world that our boasted love of freedom and independence is but a sham and a fraud.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARBER].

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire an opportunity to incorporate in the RECORD a statement showing the balance sheet of our account with the Philippine Islands during the two years since their acquisition, taken from an editorial in the Evening Post (New York):

To-day marks the completion of two years since the ratification of the treaty of Paris enabled President McKinley to add certain "gems and glories of the tropic seas," as he proudly called them, to the national domain. Americans are a thrifty and prudent people, unless all proverbs lie, and should be ready to strike a balance of our Philippine business up to date. The first account would relate purely to the money investment and the return thus far had, and would stand as follows:

William McKinley in account with the United States.		
Dr.		Cr.
To 1 archipelago.....	\$20,000,000	By 2 years' ex-
To benevolently assimilating the same,		ports to Philip-
730 days, at \$750,000 a day.....	547,000,000	pines, say \$3,-
To expenses able negotiators Paris		200,000, profit
treaty.....	222,000	on which, at 12
To 2 islands which able negotiators		per cent, is.....
thought they had bought.....	100,000	\$384,000
	567,322,000	
	884,000	
Profit and loss.....	566,938,000	

Evidently "there are millions in" the islands; but they are so far "in" that it may be doubted if we ever get them out.

Charles Sumner said that President Grant's scheme to annex San Domingo was but a plan to "buy a bloody lawsuit." President McKinley bought of Spain a still bloodier insurrection. The cost of the islands in terms of flesh and blood and misery should furnish the next page of our Philippine account. But here it is hard to be exact. We know, it is true, that 711 American soldiers have been killed outright in the Philippines; that 446 have died of wounds and 2,184 of disease; but no figures can set forth the story of ruined health, crippled bodies, and maimed lives which always lies behind the official returns of casualties.

Then where are we to reckon in the 30,000 Filipinos whose lives have been taken? Are they a set-off to our own losses? But they are subjects of the United States, and the Supreme Court may decide that they are our fellow-citizens. However, we will be generous and allow the imperialists to put the slaughtered Filipinos on the credit side of the account. We will also give them the slain or starved women and children, the looted homes, the smoking towns, the waste fields. It is hard to see just where the pecuniary or moral profit of all this comes in, but, such as it is, the imperialists are entitled to it.

A correct Philippine balance sheet would also show the respective profit and loss in the moral and political sphere. Figures and values can not, in this part of the statement, be sharply defined; but the two sides of the account would stand something like this:

LOSS.	GAIN.
Confidence and admiration of oppressed peoples.	Applause of arbitrary and oppressive rulers.
Gratitude of struggling republics.	Thanks of republic destroyers.
Watchwords of liberty.	Shibboleths of Empire.
Peaceful expansion.	Criminal aggression.
Ideals of the fathers.	Toys of the nursery.
Reverence for the Constitution.	Trust in force.
The party of moral ideas.	The party of the pocketbook.

Again we leave it to the imperialists to say on which side the balance is. From what we know of them we are sure, however, that, as Thomas Fuller always made the praise and glory of God come out in the conclusion, no matter what his premises, so they can infer glory and greatness and goodness where others are able to see only shame and contempt.

Any prudent business concern "writes off for depreciation," or wear and tear of plant, from time to time. We are bound to do the same in looking into the actual status of our Philippine investment. One of our most valuable pieces of machinery, for example, "the consent of the governed," is hopelessly rusted and broken down. We can never use it again and should strike it from our list of assets.

It is obvious, too, that we shall have to get something to put in the place of the old Constitution, which is plainly obsolete. "No taxation without representation" has served us long; but the really up-to-date Government plants



have now introduced "Tax according to your own sweet will" in its place, and we shall have to adopt that style. Our stock of national consistency and good faith is clearly so much depreciated that it would not be honest book-keeping to carry it any longer at par. On the other hand, our stock of false pretenses, hypocritical professions, and silly boasting has been enormously increased by our two years in the Philippines, and if we can only get the world to take it at its nominal value, we may yet be able to lift our eyes from the ground and look the nations in the face again.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman on the other side of the House to use some of his time now.

Mr. HULL. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. HULL. How much time is there on the other side?

The SPEAKER. Twenty minutes.

Mr. HULL. I suggest that the gentleman on the other side use a little more of his time. Of course, we reserve the right on this side to close. I ask the gentleman from New York to go ahead for a few minutes longer.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. LENTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, with but one beggarly hour upon a side for "debate"—God save the mark!—not the least attention can be given to the great appropriation bill upon which have been ingrafted in the Senate, in brazen disregard of the rules of that body, the amendment to lend the sanction of a degraded Congress to indefinite imperial rule, with the American President as the acting emperor of the Philippines, and that other amendment shamelessly proclaiming the repudiation of our pledge of honor to Cuba and to the world and to all the to-morrows in the history of mankind. In this House, where free speech is stifled and the gag law prevails, where the most that is accorded the representatives of the people, with these tremendous issues pending for the moment and so soon and so slavishly to be settled against liberty and honor and in favor of tyranny and shame, is "leave to print," I avail myself of this poor privilege—all that the enslaved will grant to those whose rights and the rights of whose constituents they wantonly violate—to put into the RECORD a few words, hastily penned, to express, however feebly, my protest and the protest of the liberty-loving people whom I represent (or would represent if my lord, the usurping despot, and his groveling vassals here would permit) against the deep damnation of the foul deed and of the meek servility which attends its execution.

First, a word concerning the thin gauze behind which some may fancy shelter can be found. The bugaboo of an extra session seems to be appalling to certain persons. Why, is it not a fact that all of us are paid by the year, and that our country and our respective constituents are entitled to our legislative services at all times? What right have we to what some gentlemen are pleased to call "our vacation" if there be occasion for the sitting of Congress during a portion of that "vacation" season? And where in the Constitution (if the fathers who made it, after gloriously making it possible by their heroism in battling for liberty upon a thousand bloody fields—if the fathers, bending in pity and shame upon the brink of the shining heights above and looking upon the littleness and recreancy of this hour here below—if they will pardon the reference here to that almost sacred instrument which they gave to their countrymen and to hope and aspiration universal—if they will pardon the reference to their work here among the cringing, shriveled misrepresentatives of a mighty nation)—where in the Constitution is the "vacation" exalted above duty and liberty and honor? There could be no extra session unless the President, against whose election we upon this side of the Chamber worked and voted, should see proper to call it, and why should we shrink from the contemplation of such a call? For one, I believe Congress should assemble regularly when the Congressional term begins.

Might a river and harbor bill fail to become a law, unless sacred principles be surrendered, and incalculable harm be done, and the stain of ineffaceable dishonor be put upon the flag, and perfidy be written, in unfading characters, upon the once shining record book of the Republic? Better that the rivers be choked by the shifting sands, better that the ships cease to find anchorage in the harbors, than that the wellsprings of constitutional liberty be polluted with the garbage of blind greed.

And as for the Louisiana Purchase Celebration, and the Pan-American Exhibition at Buffalo, and the exposition at Charleston, the most delicately adjusted scales can not find the smallest fraction of calculable weight in all of them combined when they are cast into the balances against the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, national honor, and human rights. Better, far better, to let all these celebrations and exhibitions go over, to be managed by other men, in another century, than to do, or to make possible the doing of, or condone, this double abomination. Better far that Buffalo wait, and wait, and wait for an appropriation until atom by atom the walls of rock over which the Niagara plunges shall have worn away and the mighty cataract shall be numbered with the things that were and are not; better far that a cycle of centuries shall roll by before the Louisiana pur-

chase shall be celebrated; better far that Charleston, vainly reaching out for an appropriation, shall wax in age and her brave men and devoted women cease to dwell in memory even; better all this than that the plighted faith of the American Republic to Cuba and to the world shall be broken in greedy wantonness, and liberty and life be the perpetual sacrifice to imperialism in the Philippines, with formal Congressional approval.

Our nation was dedicated to liberty, and some of us, come weal or come woe, will continue to strive as best we may against the swelling hosts of greed and timidity and servility to hold fast to the faith of the sages of the Revolution. How far we have wandered from the simplicity and glory of the earlier day! One hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson, the immortal author of the immortal Declaration of Independence, having been elected President of the infant Republic without the aid of privilege or the contributions of corruption or the coercion of plutocracy, came quietly to the Capitol, walking from his boarding place in Washington, now the hotel named the Varnum, and in republican simplicity took the official oath and entered upon the duties of his great office. But that was a century ago, and such things are done differently now, with an increased cost of a quarter of a million of dollars as one of the minor incidents of the change that has been wrought.

Then, too, we were not in the work of imposing our government—no; not our government, but the government of empire, by the agency of the carpetbagger, at the point of the bayonet and the mouth of the cannon, with the nasal twang of hypocritical cant between the puffs of smoke—upon an unwilling people on the other side of the globe. Then, too, every resource of constitutional resistance against such outrages upon the rights of man as declared in the Declaration, and upon the principles of our Government as embodied in the Constitution, would have been employed if any party could then have been found base enough to attempt what is to be perpetrated now. Yes, changes have taken place since the days of Jefferson.

When we entered into the war with Spain we declared—

That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Did we mean what we said? Were we hypocrites then? Or are we unblushingly rushing into the embrace of dishonor now?

Then we also solemnly declared—

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Now, what candid man can say that the amendment with reference to Cuban affairs, so complacently lodged in this appropriation bill, can be harmonized, or is intended to be harmonized, with our lofty pretensions, expressed in the words which I have quoted? How could hypocrisy go further, or shamelessness be more transparent, than in the pretense upon pretense embodied in this amendment? What profligate irony—repeating the words of a pledge with sanctimonious unction, while breaking it, letter and spirit, with brutal indifference!

Let us get what comfort we may out of the hope that the wisdom and virtue and patriotism of the Cubans (until the pride of the American people—their sense of honor, their sense of shame—shall come to the rescue) may avert the calamities which our perfidy invites. Cubans, be patient under the wrongs which we are inflicting upon you! Rest upon the hope that American honor will yet assert itself—that dishonor can not rule here forever! Do not, in righteous indignation, do anything which may be seized upon by those who, having dishonored themselves, await with eager greed and pretext, however flimsy, to despoil "said island." And American sons of freedom, remember the lesson of all the ages: Honor is priceless, and perfidy is death. Stand by your solemn pledge to Cuba; cling to the letter and the spirit of your noble proclamation to the world. Not all the wealth of all the islands of all the seas could recompense you for the loss of honor; and your honor is gone unless you right the wrong done the Cubans, and the still greater wrong done yourselves, and retire to the pitying embrace of charitable obscurity the men who are working this monster iniquity.

As an incident in the war with Spain our fleet destroyed a Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila, in the Philippine Islands. Later, we entered upon operations for the capture of the city of Manila, and the destruction of the Spanish power in those islands. We found willing and efficient allies in this warfare in the Filipino forces, under the command of Aguinaldo. Success crowned the united efforts of our army and their army, the Spanish flag came down from the walls of Manila, nevermore to be raised, and the glorious stars and stripes and the Filipino flag waved in triumph. The land was redeemed, as then it was thought, from the blight, the curse, the measureless wrong of alien rule, imposed and maintained by force.

Commissioners met in the city of Paris to negotiate a treaty of peace, but there was no room in the council chamber for any representative of Filipino land. One imbued with the principles of



free government and familiar with the noble declaration of our independence from Great Britain might take it for granted that we would look out for the Filipino, our friend and ally. And it is evident that we did look out for him—as our prey. For many weary, bloody months hundreds of millions of dollars of our treasure have been spent, and thousands of our young men have been sacrificed, in the tyrant attempt to impose our rule upon the Filipinos against their will, with fire and sword.

Whatever of law has attended our march and marked our slaughter and devastation has been the unrestrained will of the President. Hitherto a subservient Congress sat with folded hands while the work of the empire progressed or retrogressed under the untrammelled sway of the President. Now "Congress is to share the responsibility of the Executive." Thank God, it is not in the power of all the minions of the empire to force upon the minority in this House any sharing of that awful responsibility! We are powerless to prevent the action which you, in doing the bidding of your masters, are about to take, just as we were powerless to prevent these amendments from coming into the House upon this appropriation bill, with the days of this Congress almost numbered. If henceforth, until even you shall sicken of the slaughter and the waste, or until the American people shall assert themselves, and as the first and indispensable stroke for the recovery of their honor, which you turn into dishonor, and the protection of their free institutions, which you devote to the deeds of despotism, hurl you from power, imperialism in the Philippines is to have Congressional sanction, none of the infamy can attach to the minority, whom your denial of free speech renders voiceless now in this Chamber.

The Spaniards had but a poor foothold in the Philippines when Dewey sailed into Manila Bay. Outside of the few towns garrisoned by them, the power of the Filipino, even then, was omnipotent. When Spanish dominion was terminated by the triumph of the joint forces of the Americans and the Filipinos, Aguinaldo completed the structure of the temporary government which, with our concurrence and approval, he had proclaimed promptly upon his return from exile, whence he had been summoned by Dewey to our aid; and his followers were armed and equipped in part by Dewey for the work which he and they gladly undertook and efficiently performed for us and themselves and their countrymen. This Aguinaldo government, even in embryo, was adapted to the wants of the Filipinos, who gave cheerful allegiance to it. Aguinaldo builded his government upon our model, and we have builded our Government in the Philippines upon the Spanish model.

Under Aguinaldo's rule peace and contentment prevailed generally among the Filipinos; and there is little room for doubt that if we had not shot the Aguinaldo government to pieces, it, a good government for the Filipinos, would now be protecting them and guarding efficiently all the rights of foreign subjects domiciled in the islands. Instead of that we have carried desolation to our late allies—death to many, misery to more, vice and drunkenness to a multitude, and despair and desperation to all. As I have already stated, this was done as the President willed and as his irresponsible emissaries executed. Congress being negatively responsible. Now Congress, with the minority gagged, registers the decrees of imperialism and strives in indecent haste to make more pretentious the absolute reign which before it tolerated.

Whatever of woes shall come, whatever of fresh disgrace shall attend, however deep our degradation may be before conscience resumes its wonted sway, whatever penalty Providence shall impose upon our nation for being Spanish instead of American in its administration, however severely our own governmental fabric shall be wrenched, however measureless may be the wrongs which we are perpetrating, however long greed may shove patriotism aside, however long a dollar may seem larger than a man, a franchise greater than a myriad of human lives, temporary loot more valuable than a multitude of immortal souls—whatever may come, we of the minority in this House, rendered powerless here now, will stand in the brighter day behind the impregnable walls of the Constitution, unconquered and unconquerable, and with no stain of this dishonor upon us, with no stench of this perfidy about us. You silence us now, but we shall yet be heard when you will be silent, not because of the denial of free speech, but because you shall be busy praying in voiceless penitence for the rocks and the mountains to fall upon you and hide from the wrath of the aroused American spirit of justice, equality, and rational liberty, which to-day you crucify.

Mr. LENTZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

[Mr. RYAN of New York addressed the House. See Appendix].

Mr. LENTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

[Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the House. See Appendix].

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, to be or not to be free is the ques-

tion Cuba is asking in the beginning of 1901, just as she was asking this question about three years ago. But when she was asking it in 1898 she had in mind the question of freedom from a hereditary despot. To-day asking it she has in mind the tyranny of a majority, and that majority having been secured by bribery and falsehood and other means of corrupting the voters of the land. To lie or not to lie is the question before the American people. We told Cuba and the world that our war against Spain was neither for conquest nor for the acquisition of territory, but purely in the cause of liberty and humanity. In that declaration we gave the Filipinos, just as much as the Cubans, a bond that we would use our strong arm to secure for them the right of self-government. Why is it that those who are now fattening in the land because this Government keeps its bond to pay principal and interest on Government debts express no concern or solicitude whatever that this solemn bond should be kept, as we pledged ourselves to do on that night when we declared that the people of Cuba "are, and of right ought to be, free."

I am not alone concerned about the sacrifice of our own character and reputation in this betrayal of the people of Cuba and of the Philippine Islands, but I am much more concerned about the gradual dry rot that is taking place in the American conscience. We could afford to be guilty of sacrificing unnecessarily some of our young manhood, but we can not afford to violate practically all of the ten commandments in this brutal and murderous warfare which we are making in the Philippine Islands. The lack of moral growth and the absolute hardening and degrading of American conscience that is manifest to-day is the greatest menace to American liberty and American progress that this Republic has ever seen. The encroachment made upon liberty by Nicholas Bidle and his greedy associates in the days of Andrew Jackson and the threatened destruction of the Union by the slavocracy in the day of Abraham Lincoln are diseases of minor importance when compared with the tyranny and criminal aggression now manifest in every act and every word of those who favor the present policy of the Federal Government.

For some time I have been accustomed to liken our wickedness in the Philippine Islands to that of England in South Africa. But, speaking of the matter a day or two ago to a gentleman and his wife, placing the conduct of the two nations on the same level, the good wife of my friend interrupted me to suggest that the conduct of England in South Africa was far more honorable than our conduct in the Philippine Islands. She suggested, and I think with entire justification, that England had the advantage over us, in that she is honest enough and frank enough to admit to the world that she is making war to the death on the two South African Republics not because of any purpose of benevolent assimilation, but purely and simply because it is her habit to go about the face of the earth seeking whom she may devour. England admits that her purpose is to secure possession of the rich gold fields and other property which the Boers, in their search for liberty, had discovered.

We, the good wife argued, are making war on the Filipinos for the benefit of a few of our speculators and governmental jobbers, and have our highest officials in the National Government prating to the world that we are doing it for the purpose of Christian civilization and for benevolent assimilation. The difference between the policy of England and the policy of America is as wide as the difference between frankness and hypocrisy. In that conversation I had commented on the shameful and the barbarous brutality manifested by Great Britain in the last battle in which the lion-hearted Cronje participated. I had made comparison between what took place in Cronje's last fight and some of the pictures of Rome in her pagan days, when she threw the Christians, men and women, into the arena to be torn and fed upon by lions, tigers, dogs, and other brutes. In that conversation I read and here submit a description given in the Washington Evening Times of the 27th of February, 1900, which is as follows:

Cronje surrendered, saying he wished to save the women and children. Throughout that week the grim old African lion Cronje, with 3,000 men, held out against the persistent assaults of Roberts's 45,000 men. The Boer laager was on fire most of the time after the third day's battle from British lyddite shells. Shot and shell were poured into the laager by the British, and the condition of affairs in the camp of the Boers was something frightful. They had run entirely out of food, their ammunition had given out, and the laager was strewn with the corpses of the dead, lying in the broad light, unburied and festering. The wounded were in an awful plight. The hospital corps was insufficient to attend to them, and they lay about the laager in heaps, some crying piteously, others shrieking in their pain, many silently enduring their agonies.

Is it possible for anyone claiming membership in any one of the Christian churches to gaze on this picture of fifteen Britons murdering one Boer, and say that this picture is not far more disgraceful and savage than anything ever perpetrated upon any human being by even the vilest or most brutal of the pagan Romans? Is there not much in this to justify Buckle's deduction when he says that civilization had developed intellectuality, but not morality; and if it be true, as my friend argued, that England has the advantage over America in being frank instead of hypocritical, then



what language can be found strong enough to describe the crimes which we are perpetrating in the Philippine Islands? Evidences are coming thick and fast that we are perpetrating outrages in many forms against the Filipinos, and that in those outrages we are violating individually and collectively the commandments, "Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not lie; thou shalt not commit adultery." What a legacy will be coming home to America in the spiritual and physical wrecks that are to return to us as American soldiers. Comment need not be enlarged on this subject. I insert here a statement from the issue of date February 23, 1901, of the Bulletin of the American Iron and Steel Association, of Philadelphia, which is as follows:

Three soldiers from Johnstown and vicinity, who enlisted a year or so ago to go to the Philippines, are back at their homes, having been returned as invalids on the transport *Sherman*. They were not much more than shadows when they arrived. All declare the climate in which they served to be something horrible, and that white men can not serve in it over a few months and keep their health. The *Sherman* carried 800 souls, of which 297 were invalid volunteers, including 16 insane.

John W. Kissel, of Edenville, Franklin County, Pa., who was a member of the Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, in the Philippines, has returned to his home on account of bad health. On the steamer in which he returned to this country there were 400 soldiers, the majority of them being ill, and 200 bodies of soldiers who had died on the islands or on the way over. Kissel says he has had enough of war in the Philippines.

A dispatch from Washington, dated February 18, says: General MacArthur has informed the War Department that the transports *Hancock* and *Kilpatrick* left Manila yesterday for the United States. The *Hancock* has the Thirtieth Volunteer Infantry on board, and the *Kilpatrick* carries 400 sick soldiers.

It may assist some to understand the real conditions in the Philippine Islands if I quote from a letter recently received from a soldier who has been there long enough to speak with authority and whose language is sufficient evidence of his intelligence.

One extract is as follows:

I wish I could tell you in person my impressions of this country and its people. You would be astonished and pleasantly surprised at some things. The people are constantly misrepresented by men who have their own interests to subserve and by men also who can see no good in anyone here.

In the communities below the mountain sections the people are law-abiding, industrious, temperate, moral, and religious. It is true they are in arms, shooting and being shot, but when one considers they are fighting us as invaders and despoilers one can not blame them for continuing to hope for what is theirs, or should be, if justice prevailed.

Concerning their aptitude for self-government, no sane man will doubt it, for they are, in fact, governing themselves at the present time, except in the untutored savage portion of the archipelago. The least government is the best for this people. To change or force a change to the American plan would be folly. These people are satisfied to be let alone and to live as they have been living. Give them proof that we are not here to despoil them, and peace is assured.

The morality of the people has suffered through the soldiers. The soldiers look upon the women as common property. Even some of the officers appropriate women to their lust; yet the people stand it, for they fear to offend by complaining. The Americans have brought the drink habit to these islands. They have promoted immorality, and their conduct has brought shame to many, but they say, "That's the way with the invaders of every country," and there is no recourse for those who come under their control. The commission is the whole thing in Manila. Everything is done in the name of the President of the United States. Great is the President! Great sums of money are spent here. Some day great scandals will grow out of the whole business; it is inevitable.

What American can read such a letter as this, bearing such evidence of fairness and keen observation, without feeling that Haunauism and McKinleyism in the Philippines are blood cousins to Weyerism in Cuba?

What American can read this and feel like voting for hundreds of millions of the people's money to be expended in criminal aggression and murder in the Philippines?

Less than a year ago I warned the country that when you cut down the military appropriation from \$128,000,000 to \$112,000,000 it was done to deceive the taxpayers. I then asserted that \$128,000,000 would not cover the war expenditures. A few days ago, when we passed the deficiency bill, after tedious interrogatories I succeeded in forcing the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to admit that it was necessary to make an additional deficiency appropriation of \$21,000,000, which, added to the \$112,000,000, makes the appropriation for this fiscal year ending July 1, 1901, \$133,000,000, or, in round figures, \$110,000,000 more than was appropriated for war purposes four years ago. In other words, we have entered upon a policy which in one Department alone will require more than \$100,000,000 of additional expenditure from year to year for many years to come, to say nothing of the additional expenditures of scores of millions that will be required in the naval establishment.

It would have been far better could we within this Congress just closing have spent our time discussing and developing the post-check system, which would have facilitated and simplified the sending of money by mail—an urgent necessity, as every business man well knows. But we have been so extremely mad with this business of taking on the title of "world power" that we have gone abroad minding everybody's business and neglecting our own. I introduced in the House the post-check bill, and Senator McMILLAN introduced it in the Senate, which was a measure indorsed by the business men throughout the country and indorsed by the leading newspapers throughout the country, yet we could not get for it even a moment's consideration. Many

other bills have been pigeonholed and our homes and our families have been neglected while we have gone to the other side of the earth imitating the monarchs of Europe, and with them pretending that in some way we have received a divine commission to attend to the business of governing the other nationalities of the earth.

While our "plain duty" to the Filipinos should insure our granting them self-government, our duty to ourselves would still more strongly point to that course. It is almost unnecessary to state that the Philippine Islands can never be of any material benefit to the masses of the American people, however much the lands and franchises may enrich a few exploiters. On the other hand, we have spent, and are spending, and must perforce continue to spend, hundreds of millions of dollars to guard them from within and without. It will be remembered that they are surrounded by nations which may at any moment become hostile to us, and without an immense navy and enormous incessant expense we are forever to be at the mercy of any combination of these nations.

To-day we are humiliatingly subservient to Great Britain on that account. Already we have permitted her to take our territory and our citizens in Alaska. She harbors the Filipino junta at Hong-kong, openly plotting against us, and we dare not say her nay. She built the Canadian Pacific Railroad as a military base immediately on our northern borders, and now she is about to build a parallel line in case the Canadian Pacific should at any time be blocked. She has sent Sir Edward Warren, her greatest military engineer, to Canada, and has arbitrarily seized the island of Anticosti for the purpose of fortifying it. She is delaying the building of the Nicaraguan Canal to keep closed that means of connection with the Pacific Ocean, and is attempting, with our acquiescence and virtual assistance, the subjugation of two sister republics in South Africa. If she succeeds, she will have practical control of South Africa. She controls the Straits of Gibraltar and Suez Canal, and we are thus completely at her mercy for peaceable transit to the Philippines by that route. When we were confined to our own illimitable and inexhaustible continent, the surface of which has only been scratched, and the resources of which have barely been touched, we were masters of the situation. We were truly a "world power."

To-day we are a world mendicant, seeking whom we may placate. We have been befogged, befooled, and betrayed by England. It was said, "Beware of the Greeks, even when bearing gifts." The same is true of England. With the honeyed phrases about the Anglo-Saxon race, and blood being thicker than water, she has cajoled a few pin-head politicians and sycophantic plutocrats in the United States. She told the Paris peace commission that 5,000 soldiers would be sufficient to hold the Philippines. Instead, it takes 75,000. Who pays? We. Who is weakened? We.

But her prime object in all the diplomacy by which she has fooled us so completely is to take our minds off Canada. She knew that the war fever had only been whetted by our brush with Spain, and she succeeded only too well in drawing a herring across the track leading to our northern neighbor.

Hence the betrayal of our ideals. In our present humiliating predicament we find hostile territory in Cuba and the Philippines, the South American Republics rendered uneasy and suspicious, perfidious Albion surrounding us on every side and constantly strengthening her position, the faith of millions of our own people in our Constitution shaken. Our condition is truly lamentable. Had we granted Cuba and the Philippines self-government asking only such naval and coaling stations as we deemed necessary, and which would have been freely given, we would not only have been a world power, but a world master. We could have insisted on Canada being given autonomy or annexed to the United States. The spirit of the Monroe doctrine has been violated by her sending troops to fight in South Africa, by her territory being made a recruiting ground for Great Britain.

Suppose we are in difficulty with England, as is inevitable, for the present "era of good feeling" will only last till England succeeds in South Africa. Would not England import troops from South Africa and Australia to fight us? Would the Dutch of South Africa not be justified in coming over to avenge themselves for the mules and horses, aye, and men, we have sent to help to destroy them forever? Would the Irish and the Germans who helped to save the Union which England sought to destroy be so willing to fight the English legions as they were before this unwarrantable and unwise understanding with the infamous and mendacious Chamberlain? What we should have done, if we desired expansion, was to take Canada. She has illimitable acres of public lands. She has millions of square miles of forests. We need the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence as an outlet to the Atlantic as much as we needed the Mississippi as an outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. Jefferson, that man of peace, was willing, if necessary, to go to war to secure Louisiana and Florida. The great Seward took Alaska as an entering wedge to the annexation of Canada.

We need her to complete our continental Republic. Her people



are congenial, and the vast majority of them willing for the change. It would benefit them even more than it would us. We could, without danger of interference, develop our domestic institutions on national lines, as the people of New Zealand and Australia are doing. Large armies and huge navies, with ever recurring and ever increasing cost, would be unnecessary. The best and bravest of our sons would not be condemned to death or a living hell by reason of residence in torrid climes. Our free institutions would not be turned into autocratic despotism. In the play of Quo Vadis, the courtly and learned Petronius is told by the miserable Caesar that he has "lived too long." McKinley, in effect, says the same thing day after day when he removes men from office. Everything depends on the whim of one man, and arbitrary power will make even a good man bad and a bad man a demon. Our institutions need development in accordance with principles of justice and equity. Instead of concentration of power, we need a balance which conserves the principles of individual liberty without weakening the state. To do this, the power of patronage must be taken away from the President as far as possible.

In this way the popularity of Executive action can be effectually passed upon at least every two years. As a matter of fact, a state of anarchy has existed in the United States and Territories for the past four years. No one knows what may be done next. The programme foreshadowed one week is departed from the next. Even judicial decisions are reversed to order. Murder is constantly on the increase in the United States, and wholesale murder, under the guise of war, is chronic in the Philippines, while bribery and corruption are wholesale at home and abroad. To compensate for this there is a plethora of wealth in the hands of a few, and the glittering baubles of empire held up to dazzle the unthinking masses.

The statesmanlike solution, if we are to go into the expansion business, is to annex Canada, and to do it now while England is in difficulty. Turn the Philippines over to her own people, who have shown themselves amply able to take care of themselves, and protect them till they are on sure foundation, securing coaling and naval stations. In this way we will have the friendship of a nation of ten millions in the Orient, guarding the security of our interests in that quarter; we will have disarmed the suspicions of our southern neighbors; we will have our great Republic strengthened from the Arctic to the Equator, impregnable in its solidarity, and probably peacefully acquiring the country to the Isthmus of Panama at no distant day, and thus we can go on and on in paths of peace, which is vouchsafed to men of good will on earth.

We have undertaken to legislate for the Filipinos, ignoring their own desires, and giving no heed to their aspirations, but for my part I believe it is only fair and just that they should be allowed to speak, even through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore offer as a part of my remarks the address of Apacible, one of their representatives, as contained in his appeal to the American people, dated June, 1900.

#### *To the American people:*

God Almighty knows how unjust is the war which the imperial arms have provoked and are maintaining against our unfortunate country. If the honest American patriots could understand the sad truth of this declaration, we are sure they would, without the least delay, stop this unspeakable horror. And that they may have a just understanding of it, we entreat them to hear our voice, to meditate on our exhortations, and to weigh our statements against the misrepresentations under which imperialism seeks to conceal its designs. Turn not away from our prayer, Americans, but listen and give judgment according to reason and conscience.

We, the Filipinos, are a civilized, progressive, and peace-loving people. Many impartial writers and speakers have testified that we are advanced in civilization, that we are capable of improvement, that many of our people for two centuries have enjoyed the advantages of university education, that the number of illiterates among our people is small, and that as artists, scientists, magistrates, generals, and dignitaries of the church, the sons of the Philippines, have distinguished themselves greatly and have achieved many positions of eminence, especially so in Spain. That we are progressive was well shown by the conduct of our whole country when, at the time of the capitulation of the city of Manila, the inhabitants of our islands, supposing themselves to have entered upon a career of national independence that was to be assured to them by the United States Government, instead of abandoning themselves to any revolutionary fever and excess, established with careful thought and scrupulous regard for justice a prudent government which respected all rights created legitimately; they convoked a congress whose legislative work has not been justly criticised by anybody; they reorganized the administrative machinery which had been disturbed by recent struggles; telegraphs, railroads, and means of communication began to work regularly; we had adopted the electric light in some of our towns; and we had established a new university, four high and several primary schools. In brief, the new nation had entered upon a path of progress which already promised a bright future. All this progress the imperialists have disturbed; all this progress have they destroyed.

For proof that we love peace, we ask you to remember the story of our relations with Spain. For three hundred years our country has been at the mercy of Spanish domination; we were the subjects of that monarchy; the Government of that nation denied us any voice in the enactment of remedial legislation; they denied us representation in the Spanish Cortes. They allowed themselves to be directed by the most reactionary elements, and took counsel chiefly from the friars who sought to estrange the mother country from us and to deny us the blessings of liberty, so that they might the more completely exploit us at their will. They denied us freedom of the press, restricted the right of peaceable assembly, and violated the security of our homes. They created the so-called administrative process (*expedientes gubernativos*); so that often without hearing and without trial the most peaceable citizen was snatched from his house and condemned to the miseries of

banishment. In brief, the Spanish Government, whose despotic cruelty American imperialism now imitates, and in some respects surpasses, denied to us many of the liberties which you were already enjoying when, under pretext of oppression, you revolted against British domination.

Notwithstanding these great wrongs, we submitted quietly, confining our protests to earnest prayers for reparation, such was our love of peace. Only when we became convinced that our requests were absolutely disregarded, that the most worthy officials were removed from office, even those of eminent character, when it was made known that they had manifested even a slight sympathy for us; when we had lost every hope of peaceful remedy and all faith in the oft-promised liberal reforms; only then it was that the armed protest—the Philippine revolution, the most justifiable of all revolutions—began. It was an uprising void of every feeling of hatred and revenge toward Spain, the country that we respected and loved; it was a revolt against her bad government, just as we now revolt, not against America, whose power and greatness we recognize, and whose justice we still hope to see proven, but against her unworthy rulers. Those who tell you that we are an adventurous and seditious people, ready to go to war at the least pretext, basely deceive you in this as in many other calumnies invented by the imperialists.

If yesterday we fought against Spain, and to-day are resisting your powerful arms, even though sure to be vanquished, it is because we have been forced as a last resort to an unequal and bloody war for the attainment of an aspiring people's legitimate ambitions. Thus we can repeat proudly and with the firmness of one who carries the truth on his lips and in his heart that if our character and culture entitle us to independence, still more do we show ourselves entitled to it by the high motives which have always inspired our resistance. Why, then, do you deny us liberty? Why, forgetful of all your history and the noble precepts of your illustrious forefathers, are you fighting against the cause of independence, of progress, and of justice, which is our cause? What has come to pass between you and us that should cause you to permit this incredible and monstrous war to be waged against us?

When you declared war against Spain you proclaimed to the world at large that you had appealed to arms only in order to free oppressed peoples; and when your flag waved before the coasts of the Philippines on powerful vessels which easily destroyed the weak fleet of the enemy it was an emblem of liberty then. Your diplomatic representatives invited the most famous of our Filipino leaders, Hon. E. Aguinaldo, to an offensive alliance against those whom you represented to us as a "common enemy," in order that by vanquishing them we might achieve our aspirations for peace and happiness. It was then that your idol, Admiral Dewey, and your distinguished generals, Merritt and Anderson, treated us as friends and allies, saying sincerely that we were fit for independence, even more so, as the Admiral asserted, than the Cubans to whom you have with equity promised to give it. It was then that the flag of the new Philippine nation waved in the shadow of the Stars and Stripes at Manila Bay. It was then that the independence of the Philippines was proclaimed at Cavite, within range of your cannons, without any opposition, and in almost the very words of your immortal Declaration.

It was then that your soldiers hailed the new nation, while ours were cheering the American liberators. It was then, to save your cause, since you had assured us that your cause embraced our freedom, that the Filipinos gave their blood for you in your fight against a valiant and obstinate enemy and at the same time placed in your reach all available resources and aid. You were at that moment almost at the point of breaking into hostilities with another nation which had manifested her sympathy for Spain by attempting to bar at Subig Bay the course of what you yourselves had called "an army of liberation." That was the hour of the beautiful fiction; now we seem to have come to the time of the bitter reality, the cruel disenchantment. Then we were received and treated as allies; now we are scourged back into the mountains and denied every right except that of fighting the very flag in whose beneficent shadow we had expected to find freedom and happiness.

From the outset our country took sides with the United States in the war with Spain, and we marched proudly with your sons as comrades in arms, as soldiers in the same cause, to victory. At all times during that war, and for months afterwards, the civil, military, and naval authorities of the United States caused us to hope for independence. Papers and pamphlets advocating this ideal were published in Manila under the protection of the United States authorities; with their consent the revolutionary army had been conquering the Spanish positions and establishing in them provincial governments dependent on that of the Philippine republic. America was then a great Republic releasing the Cubans and the Filipinos from the iron grasp of an imperial government and conducting them to emancipation and freedom; and our people hailed the Stars and Stripes as an emblem of freedom, as the token of liberty for the living and a badge of honor for the patriots dead.

With renewed energy, with proud alacrity, with fearless determination they pressed on, side by side with your noble sons to the end. What reward did we get? Did the expected freedom come to us? No! As a requital for our sacrifices and as a reward for our loyalty, subjugation is offered to us instead of freedom. We may have a colonial government of the United States, administered in a foreign language, instead of the colonial government of Spain, which, at least, was administered in a language already known to us and which we have made ours. We are to have a colonial government which will deny us the citizenship of its nation. In spite of their imperialistic tendencies, the Spanish Government never went so far as to deny us citizenship.

When, on a day of sad recollections, we declined to accept this shame, when we protested against this iniquitous ingratitude, then the guns of the United States were turned upon us; we were denounced as traitors and rebels; you destroyed the homes to which you had been welcomed as honored guests, killing thousands of those who had been your allies, mutilating our old men, our women, and our children, and watering with blood and strewing with ruins the beautiful soil of our Fatherland. Behold, therefore, Americans, and consider not only our right to independence, but what your conduct has been, and what your plain duty is toward us in good faith, and then judge, in view of these antecedents, whether the crusade of extermination which the imperialists have inaugurated against our unfortunate country is a worthy one, whether it is just, and whether it is in the least degree excusable.

These and only these are the true terms of the simple problem. Do not give ear to the specious arguments of those who, in order to excuse a political crime and in order to disguise their greed and covetousness, tell you the contrary by means of assertions whose falseness is as great as the bad faith of their authors. They tell you that we are incapable of self-government, as if the accomplished facts had not proven the contrary, and as if, also, all the Americans who had calmly judged us previous to this war of conquest had not unanimously asserted otherwise. They assure you that there exist deep divisions among us and that the withdrawal of the American troops would create anarchy and misgovernment in our country, as if it were not evident that the most complete order prevailed there until the imperial troops had, with their unjust war, brought confusion.

They tell you that the government of the Philippine republic had never been recognized by the whole country. This is a manifest falsehood, because it had been recognized even by the Mohammedans in the south whom the



imperialists, their friends and allies, boast so much of having reduced to submission, and by the mountain races of Luzon, who always refused to recognize the Spanish Government, and who will do the same to the American Government. The Philippine government is the only one which can conciliate and redeem them, for in that government only have they confidence—a success for civilization which imperialism could never accomplish. They assert that the existence of these mountain races makes the Philippine independence impossible. This is an absurd assertion, which would be equal to maintaining that you are incapable of self-government simply because there are Indians on your soil in a proportion almost equal to that which the Ingorotes, Aetas, etc., represent among us.

They mislead you with the idea that because the Tagalogs, the Visayos, the Ilocanos, etc., speak different dialects, it is not feasible for us to constitute a national unity. This is an objection of gross ignorance which forgets that in the most civilized European nations people speak different dialects and even different languages, as in the highly civilized Switzerland. It is also a sophistical objection which overlooks the fact that in all the provinces of the Archipelago, in the Tagal, the Visayan, and the Ilocos provinces, etc., whose inhabitants are of the same ethnical condition and culture, the only language officially spoken is the Spanish. They allege that the majority of the Filipinos are in favor of the American sovereignty, and that they would rather be colonials of America than be independent. This is a base falsehood, which belies the fact of the thousands of soldiers which the imperialists have had to put on the islands, and of the régime of military tyranny more terrible than was ever known before by us, of which they were compelled to avail themselves, imprisoning thousands of honest people, suppressing serious newspapers, and other endless abuses against all law, in order to smother the cries for independence.

They also tell you that we were the aggressors in the present war, as if it were not evident how much we have done in order to prevent the outbreak of hostilities with which we were daily provoked, and how many times we proposed a cessation in the fight in order that we may come to an agreement, a demand which your rulers have always refused to grant us. They further tell you that our country has great and unexploited riches, and that with it America would gain. This is a new deception of imperialism, because such treasures, even the mines, have already been carefully exploited by Spaniards, Germans, and English, and they never obtained the marvelous success of which imperialism now dreams; on the contrary, the record of these exploitations shows more failure than success.

They go on to say that there are in our country rich lands to distribute and cultivate. To this the deceived American immigrants who, believing such promises, shall go and succumb to the rigors of the climate, so fatal to their race, will answer, accusing those who made them leave their rich and habitable land. That the higher interests of Christianity demand the retention of the islands is another deception, because if our subjugation becomes a reality, we could never forget how much religious fanaticisms have had to do with it, and our present Christian belief would stagger, and perhaps we would look with distrust on the creeds of our subjugators. Finally, the imperialists say that God trusted in their hands the government of the future destinies of the Philippines, as if the Supreme Spirit could have been incarnated in the gold of the \$20,000,000 which were paid to Spain and in the steel of the quick-firing guns which are mutilating the unfortunate Filipinos.

No, do not listen to the false assertions of the imperialists: listen only to the voice of reason and justice. Heed not the suggestions of those who pretend to excite your national self-love and your innermost feelings in order that you may convert yourselves into docile instruments of their cupidity and ambition, of their immoralities and scandals, which are peculiar to every colonial administration, and which have already dishonored the, until now, immaculate name of America and her foreign policy. Do not be deceived by false charges nor allured by false promises. Give judgment without hypocrisy and without self-deception. On the one hand, your honor and your glorious traditions are calling upon you to accord to us our rightful and well-earned independence. On the other hand, the distorted dreams of avarice, the dark conspiracies of greed and remorseless ambition, nurses of imperialism throughout all time, these counsel you to uphold the war of subjugation which your rulers but not your people have authorized and forced upon us.

Choose, then, sons of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Lincoln, between these two alternatives: Freedom for the hapless peoples who are in your power, and thus, under God's just laws, the recompense to you of a larger freedom for yourselves, or tyranny and destruction for your struggling but helpless victims, whose wrongs the Great Ruler of all will in due time avenge by the mournful destruction of your own liberties. Shall it be generosity or colonial greed? Shall it be right or wrong? Give ear to your own conscience and we are sure you will incline yourselves toward mercy, toward justice, and toward the only honorable course that will restore peace to our ransacked homes and to our devastated fields, stopping at once and forever this horrible war, which has already cost so much in treasure and blood, and which, if not abandoned, will yet cost much more, because our resolution is fixed: Liberty or death; independence or annihilation.

Why do the imperialists wish to subjugate us? What do they intend to do with us? Do they expect us to surrender, to yield our inalienable rights, our homes, our properties, our lives, our future destinies to the absolute control of the United States? What would you do with our 9,000,000 of people? Would you permit us to take part in your elections? Would you concede to us the privilege of sending Senators and Representatives to your Congress? Would you allow us to erect one or more Federal States? Or, would you tax us without representation? Would you change your tariff laws so as to admit our products free of duty and in competition with the products of your own soil? And thus would you allow the American trust to utilize our cheap labor in the manufacture of goods that would compete with the products of your own factories? Would you permit the trusts to bottle up our people to subserve their own ends, depriving us even of those liberties which you are enjoying?

Would you admit our artisans, mechanics, laborers, and servants to take employment in your country on an equal footing with American citizens, Indians, and negroes? Would you allow us to prohibit Chinese immigration? Would you permit us to retain our own language and not force us to adopt yours? Would you let us elect our own local officers? Would you allow us to share your offices, your honors, and your privileges? And, as for the saloons (which were almost unknown in Manila before), would you allow them to go on multiplying at the appalling rate at which their number has increased there within the past two years? Would you allow the lands in the Philippines to remain all untaxed, as formerly, simply because some religious corporations have acquired enormous and fraudulent properties in them?

Would you remove your American soldiery and permit us to create an army of our own? Or, if you were determined to maintain a powerful army and fleet in order to protect your newly acquired "property" from foreign ambitions, and from our natural and perpetual anxieties for liberty, would you do this solely at your own expense, because the revenues of a poor country like ours could not do so? You who so ardently protest against the destruction by England of two small republics which challenged her to war, would you continue to remain indifferent whilst your rulers are destroying a sister republic which is much more helpless than those of South Africa, and which,

far from declaring war against you, was your obliging friend, your successful ally? What would you do with the Philippines and the Filipinos if you refused to allow them to become a new American State, if you refused to allow them to enjoy your citizenship?

Imperialism knows not how to answer these questions. It is inspired only by greed, by a vile thirst for gold, and by the lust of spoliation. But, ever misled by its ruthless impulses, it can not determine which would be its better plan, which should be its settled purpose for the future, or how far it may safely indulge its insatiable appetites, for the dilemma is inexorable. Either the retention of the Philippine Islands, if it is realized with a noble purpose, will result in great harm to your industries and your commerce or it will become a system of merciless and shameful colonial spoliation, which will forever blot out the honor of whatever there is that is lofty and noble in your history. Can it be possible, sons of America, that you will allow us to become subjects or slaves? Should this happen, how will you reconcile it with the wise and noble principles set forth in your Declaration of Independence?

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Will you transform these beautiful and honorable sentiments into specious deceptions, fraudulent promises, and high-sounding but hollow words? No! You can not belie your whole history. You can not tolerate the violation which imperialism is so evidently working against your most venerable and fundamental principles. Until Congress succeeds in redressing the illegal aggressions of which we are the victims, and shall suppress these violations of reason, of solemn contracts, and of the elementary conceptions of gratitude we shall rely upon and appeal to the high sense of justice which has hitherto so honorably characterized the free American conscience. We do not believe you will allow us to be enslaved; it would be a dishonor to yourselves.

Influence, then, as soon as possible your legislators and rulers to give us self-government, which by right belongs to us, and peace will be restored immediately, to your benefit and ours, ending the now incessant and fruitless bloodshed entailed upon us by the present war.

We are ready to make peace, and in order to facilitate this end we propose—  
First. That we will pay back to the United States the \$20,000,000 paid by them to Spain.

Second. That the most amicable and perpetual commercial relations shall exist between us for our mutual benefit and for the greater progress of our country.

Third. That we will grant to the United States whatever space is reasonably necessary for coaling stations outside of our established cities.

Fourth. That we will not allow monopolies of any kind in the islands, and that we will give to your citizens all the guarantees and protection accorded to our own citizens for the security of life and property.

Fifth. That we are ready to entertain whatever terms you may desire for yourselves, so long as they do not infringe upon our individual and political liberties, or upon the integrity of our nationality.

After these offers it only remains that you, the free citizens of America, for the glory of your name throughout the world and for the honor of your flag, shall do justice. Thus shall the hands of your noble sons be no longer stained with innocent blood. Thus shall it not be said that the vile inspirations of greed have banished from your hearts those lofty traditions of liberty and philanthropy which you have inherited from your honest forefathers.

Toronto, June, 1900.

For the Central Filipino Committee.

G. APACIBLE.

In addition, so much has been loosely written about the desires of the Filipinos by Americans who have no true knowledge of what such desires may be that I add to my remarks the letter of an accomplished Filipino, Sixto Lopez, to Major-General Wheeler, dated June 30, 1900:

41 WOBURN PLACE, LONDON, W. C., June 30, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Having been favored with a copy of your circular letter requesting a statement of opinion on certain matters relating to the Philippines, I am desirous of furnishing replies to the several questions propounded by you.

Your circular is addressed to "eminentes Filipinos." I do not know exactly to what class you refer by that superscription, but I beg to assure you that I do not profess to be in any sense "eminent." Nevertheless, I am confident that the views herein expressed are those held by an overwhelming majority of my countrymen.

"It will be of great interest," you declare, "to those who may have to legislate on Philippine affairs to know the opinions of eminent Filipinos." Allow me to cordially congratulate you on being the only eminent American, among those who desire to take our country by force, who has deemed it of any interest to know the desires and opinions of the Filipinos on vital questions. I gratefully acknowledge that there are many eminent Americans who have spoken and written in favor of not only our cause, but also the cause of human liberty. But among those whose policy embraces the forcible annexation of our country and who profess that that policy is dictated by motives of philanthropy you stand preeminent as being the only one who has ever dreamed that the Filipinos have opinions which might be worthy of even passing attention.

The following are the questions in your circular letter, to which replies are given:

Question I. "It is the opinion of many that the war between Americans and Filipinos and the consequent bloodshed might have been avoided. Be kind enough to say what was the cause of the conflict and bloodshed, and if it could have been avoided?"

Your question may for convenience be subdivided thus: What was the cause of the war? Could the war and bloodshed have been avoided? To the first of these questions the reply is, that not being in the Philippines at the time of the outbreak of hostilities I can not speak from personal contact or observation. But from abundant evidence which has come from our people and from official reports published in American papers I am convinced that the conflict, in so far as our general and soldiers were concerned, was a pure accident due to misinterpretation of the acts of American soldiers. As to the ulterior motives, if such existed, which induced the American soldiers to fire the first shot and to shed the first blood I here express no opinion. But I am firmly convinced that if the commander of the American forces had adopted the system pursued by the Philippine army, of simply arresting those who ignorantly or wittingly crossed the lines of the respective forces, the conflict would not have occurred.

Of far more importance is the question as to whether the war and bloodshed could have been avoided. It is also much more serious, because it involves the question of moral responsibility. Every drop of blood that has been spilled, every life that has been sacrificed, the sorrow in every home made desolate in both America and the Philippines, must be charged to the



moral account of the side which is in the wrong. Our contention, therefore, is this: The Philippines were and are our country. "Forcible annexation," as your President has admirably expressed it, "would be criminal aggression. No legal quibble about 'the right of conquest and purchase' will obscure the moral question or even serve as a lubricant to conscience.

No profession of "philanthropy" or "benevolent assimilation or assimilation"—we will not quarrel about the word, the meaning is practically the same—will serve to shield your President from the charge which he has made against his own policy. Nor will it avail to offer insult to one's moral sense by claiming a legal title to sovereignty due to "cession" and "purchase" from Spain.

Spain never had a moral right to our country. Her alleged ownership rested solely on might and not on right. She never possessed even the tentative right which comes to the provider of beneficent rule.

This was recognized by the United States when it went to war on behalf of Spain's colonial possessions and demanded that Spanish sovereignty should cease. In addition to this, Spain did not possess sovereignty at the time of the so-called "cession." Her territories were in the hands of the Filipinos (with the exception of one city), who had established an independent government de facto and de jure. If Spain, then, had no moral and no legal ownership to the Philippines, who had? There is but one answer—the owners were and are the inhabitants, the Filipinos.

Who, then, is the aggressor in this war? Who is it that is endeavoring to seize and annex the Philippines over the heads of the natural owners, the inhabitants, and to purchase a doubtful legal title in the absence of a moral one? Who was it that fired the first shot and took the first life? Who is it that declares that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed?" Who is it that now seeks to deny the application of that principle of human rights to the Filipinos? Who was it that sought and accepted our aid in the conflict with Spain and now denies that we have any right whatsoever to a voice in determining the fate of the Philippines? Whoever is chargeable with these acts, on him and on them must be laid the responsibility of the war and bloodshed.

If the United States administration had promised that the principle enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and quoted above would be made applicable to the Filipinos, there never would have been a shot fired, and if that promise were now made there would be no more war. That promise could have been made and can now be made. I am therefore of opinion that the war and bloodshed could have been, and can be, avoided.

Question II. "If the Americans had abandoned the islands, would Aguinaldo have been acceptable to all the tribes, or would some have opposed his government, causing revolutions and other conflicts?"

General Aguinaldo not only "would have been acceptable" but has been accepted by what you term the "tribes." Practically all the islands sent emissaries declaring their loyal support to Aguinaldo and his government. Even the Igorrotes, and the Moros of Central Mindanao, who never submitted to Spanish rule, have acclaimed our president and government, and the former have sent gold dust to Aguinaldo to assist in the prosecution of the present war. In addition to this, the provinces of the archipelago have elected representatives—in some cases by a unanimous vote—to our "Asamblea," or house of representatives. It is true that certain Filipinos within the sphere and under the domination of the American forces, have professed being favorable to American rule. Though I do not approve it, I can quite understand their attitude.

When the British troops entered Bloemfontein, many of the Free Staters professed being favorable to British supremacy. But whatever may be the rights or the wrongs of the Anglo-Boer dispute I am quite sure that those Free Staters would much prefer Boer supremacy. The Filipinos in and around Manila are in precisely the same position as are the Free Staters in and around Bloemfontein. Take your army from the Philippines and you will soon discover whether the Filipinos are in favor of American rule! It is also true that on payment of certain emoluments by America the Sultan of Sulu has agreed to submit to American rule.

I do not wish to say anything unkind about the Sultan, but I am of the opinion that he was not entirely a free-will agent in the matter, and that his submission does not necessarily mean the submission of the people over whom he exercises a somewhat doubtful sway. At the time of the American Revolution there were no colonists who professed being favorable to English rule? Your great liberty-loving country will hardly be proud of purchased loyalty. Much has been made of the supposed favor with which some Filipinos are said to regard the prospect of American rule in the Philippines. But as a matter of fact there is an overwhelming majority of our people in favor of Filipino rule. If you doubt the truth of this statement; if you still honestly believe that the Filipinos are in favor of American rule, let a plebiscite be taken on the question.

Let it be conducted fairly and free from any threat of the sword of either General MacArthur or General Aguinaldo. Let chosen representatives of both parties superintend the voting which should be by ballot. You will find yourselves outvoted by a hundred to one even in the city of Manila. I can not give you any formal pledge, but I firmly believe that Aguinaldo and all the Filipinos would be prepared to abide by the result of such a plebiscite. If your Administration will also agree to abide by the result, the Filipinos will bear half of the incidental expenses. On behalf of the Filipinos I challenge you to put your contentions to this test. One of the first principles of republicanism is that the will of the people, expressed through the ballot, shall be supreme.

Are the Filipinos—the "savages," as some of your illustrious colleagues have defined us to be—the pleaders for, and you the deniers of, the application of this principle?

To the second part of your question, as to whether there will be any opposition to Aguinaldo's government, the reply is that we have never been foolish enough to imagine that any government in this world would be free from opposition. Is there no opposition to President McKinley's government? Was there no opposition to President Lincoln's government? Do you fondly imagine that, if your Administration ever succeeds by force of arms in establishing a government in the Philippines, there will be no opposition to it?

Undoubtedly there will be opposition—healthy opposition—to any government established in our country. But the opposition will not be between the so-called "tribes." Your question implies that if there is opposition to Aguinaldo's government, there will also be revolutions and other conflicts. If our government ever became unjust or corrupt; if it refused to admit that its "just powers of government were derived solely from the consent of the governed;" if it sought to thrust its will upon an unwilling people, it would deserve to be, and would no doubt be, subject to revolution.

But even just and righteous governments are not always exempt from such dangers. Will any high-minded American declare that the government of President Lincoln was unjust or corrupt? Yet against it was directed the greatest revolution known in the history of the world. Your question also implies that if we ever had a civil war in our country the event would prove that we are incapable of self-government. What, then, did the civil war in America prove? Every country in the civilized world has had its revolutions and its civil wars. Revolution has been the means by which tyrants and dictators have been dethroned. America will never rule the Philippines without becoming a dictator.

Give us complete franchise and the power which justly belongs thereto, and we will declare ourselves independent of America. Deny us the franchise, and you will become a dictator. Under such dictatorship there will be not only "opposition," but also an absolute certainty, sooner or later, of "revolutions and other conflicts." If you sincerely desire the pacification of our country, leave us to ourselves. Protect us, if you will, from foreign aggression, and earn not only the gratitude of our people, but also the grandest title of which a nation can boast—the title of liberator and defender of those who struggle for national life.

Your question further implies that if Aguinaldo were removed from the sphere of operations the Filipinos would be left like sheep without a shepherd. We have every confidence in President Aguinaldo. He is the object of our highest esteem and admiration. We are prepared to follow him as long as he pursues, as he has hitherto pursued, a policy of righteousness and justice. But if, through unforeseen misfortune, he should be removed from our midst, we have other men able and willing to lead our people.

Though we gratefully recognize his splendid services to our people; though we believe that he is a born leader of men, our national existence no more depends upon Aguinaldo than does the existence of the American nation depend upon President McKinley. You have evidently taken the splendid unanimity which our people have shown toward their chosen leader as an evidence that there is only one who is capable of leading. If our people had been divided into factions or "tribes" with a multiplicity of leaders, perhaps we should have been credited with the possession of many capable men! Verbum sat sapienti.

Question III. "The American nation wishes to protect the Filipinos in so far as regards their personal liberty and property, by means of an honorable government and by other licit means of just government, and to guarantee their prosperity and happiness. Do you think that the Filipinos would accept and be content under such a benevolent American government?"

I never knew that it was possible to "guarantee" happiness! President McKinley, and also the Philippine commission in its proclamation at Manila, promised to provide us with a government, the like of which is possessed by no other country in this world. According to the above-mentioned proclamation we are to have a "wise, just, stable, effective, and economical administration;" we are to be "guaranteed" an "honest and effective civil service;" the "collection and application of taxes" are to be on a "sound, honest, and economical basis;" "public funds" are to be "raised justly and collected honestly;" we are to have "prudent and honest fiscal administration;" "pure, speedy, and effective administration of justice;" our "civil rights" are to be "guaranteed and protected to the fullest extent;" "religious freedom" is to be "assured;" "all persons" are to "have an equal standing before the law;" "the evils of delay, corruption, and exploitation" are to be "effectually eradicated;" we are to be blessed by "a considerable reduction in taxation;" and the whole fabric of this magnificent government is designed for "the welfare and advancement of the Philippine people" who are to become the "constant objects" of President McKinley's "solicitude and fostering care." On top of all this you now propose to "guarantee" us "prosperity and happiness."

Why do you not adopt this sublime government in America? Do you not see that you and your commissioners "protest too much?" The word "honest" occurs four times in eight lines of the commissioners' proclamation. Why all this protestation of honesty? The greatest men speak least of greatness; the real artists seldom talk learnedly of "art;" the truest scientists are not forever dilating upon "the scientific;" honest men seldom protest their honesty.

Why do the commissioners repeatedly assure us of their "honestyisms" and "honest" intentions? Is it because they promise so much and give so little? Are they endeavoring to make up by promise what they lack in performance? I note that notwithstanding these lavish promises it still "remains with Congress to finally determine the form of government for the Philippines." The commissioners naively tell us that Arguella (Aguinaldo's emissary) was "satisfied" with the proposed government as set forth in their proclamation, but—simple soul!—he spoiled all by asking for some guaranty that this millennial government would become a fact in history.

But to be serious. Notwithstanding Senator BEVERIDGE's speech, in which he compared us to the "noble red man," who, I note in passing, has already been "benevolently assimilated," notwithstanding the apparent cordial approval with which his extraordinary speech was received by your connexionists, we cheerfully admit the absolute honesty and sincerity of intention of the people of America. At the same time, we do not believe for one moment that you or they could give us anything approaching in perfection to the government which your commissioners have promised.

But even if we were to admit that your ability is commensurate with your promises, we should still prefer to rule ourselves. All the "protection to life and property," all the "liberty under the Stars and Stripes," all the "peace and charity" and "liberty of opportunity" and "fostering care" and "honest" administration which your great nation might be able to give us would not compensate us for the loss of national life. Put the question to yourself. Would you be satisfied—assuming that some powerful nation were to deny you your independence and at the same time offer you the millennial government which you promise to give us—would you be satisfied with such foreign rule?

You know that you would not. Then do not unto others as ye would not that others should do unto you. There is no necessity to tell us how incapable we are and how enlightened you are; there is no need to argue about "legal" titles or "sovereignty by right of conquest and purchase" or the "task which Providence has imposed upon you." Put all such puerile considerations aside and come back to the golden rule. It is simple enough and embraces the whole of man's duty to man. It will show you whether you are doing right in the Philippines, and whether your legal contentions will stand the moral test. Come back to the Golden Rule and take your dripping sword from out our heart.

Question IV. "Do the Filipinos desire the construction of railways, factories, and other modern improvements?"

This question brings us down from the moral to the commercial aspect of the question. If we did not believe in the absolute sincerity of your intentions we should consider your question offensive, because it presupposes the possibility of our giving a reply in the negative. It is usually considered unnecessary to put a question seriously and deliberately unless there is the possibility either of a negative or of an affirmative reply. Now, you have been in our country. You address your questions to "eminent" Filipinos, and you thereby imply that the most enlightened of our people may be indifferent to the advantages of the arts of modern civilization. This shows how little you and your colleagues understand our people.

It also serves to destroy whatever confidence we may have had in your ability to provide a suitable government for our country, because if you do not understand a people you will never successfully govern them. But as we believe in your sincerity, we simply give a formal reply to your question. We do desire the railways and other improvements you mention, and we desire many other things which you do not mention, such as additional schools, universities, libraries, art and musical institutions, and all that pertains to the moral as well as the material advancement of our people. If it will pay your Government to build railways, it will also pay our government to do so.

You may tell us that we will not be able to find the capital for such public



works as are necessary if America withdraw her protection. We have never asked America to withdraw her protection. But if America will not protect us without annexing us, then, though we should prefer American protection, we can obtain complete protection without annexation from one of the greatest European powers. Under such protection we could obtain all the capital we require.

The final intimation in your circular letter is that "any other note on the well-being and prosperity of the Philippine government will be appreciated." I therefore beg to remark that I consider it somewhat strange that you make no mention of Filipino independence.

You ask us: Are we satisfied with Aguinaldo? Would there be opposition to his government, causing revolutions and other conflicts? Would we be satisfied with a guaranty of happiness? Do we desire railways and other improvements? But you do not ask the most important question of all. Do we desire independence? You might as well ask a drowning man if he feels cold, and if he would be satisfied with a "guaranty" that the water will be comfortably warmed! What the drowning man wants is life; what the Filipinos want is national life. What will all your honeyed promises amount to if you deny us our hearts' desire? Take from us our national life and we will never be satisfied with your promised cake and wine.

Material prosperity, though desirable, is by no means the most desirable condition. I therefore take the liberty of asking you and those who think with you a final question: Why do you shed all this blood? Why do you spend all this energy, all these millions of dollars, in the effort to thrust upon us what we desire least and deny us what we desire most? Is it for our good or for your own? For an answer to this latter question I beg respectfully to refer you to Senator BEVERIDGE'S speech on the 9th of January.

In conclusion, I beg to assure the people of America through you of our faith in their righteousness and of our belief that ere long they will give us the justice which we crave and cease to interfere with our dearly won independence.

Sincerely, yours,

SIXTO LOPEZ.

Maj. Gen. JOSEPH WHEELER, U. S. A.,  
Washington, D. C.

Inasmuch as those who have assumed to describe the Filipinos, even commissions sent out by us, have blundered, consciously and unconsciously, with regard to the very people of whom they wrote, and believing that we should know something of the tribes of the Philippine Islands, I have also added a letter of Sixto Lopez covering this particular point:

It has been suggested that I should give a few facts about the so-called "tribes" of the Philippines.

Statements have been made to the effect that we are divided into 84 tribes, speaking different languages, and of all degrees of barbarism and civilization; that these "tribes" are at enmity with each other; that they would never agree to form a united, strong government; and that one warlike "tribe" is seeking to dominate all the others, and to rule with an iron hand the weaker and peaceable citizens of our country.

These statements are entirely incorrect.

That there are a few uncivilized or semicivilized peoples still inhabiting the northern part of Luzon and the interior of the island of Mindanao is a fact which no one disputes. They correspond roughly to the uncivilized or semicivilized remnants of the Indian tribes still inhabiting certain parts of the United States.

The Schurman commission is responsible for the statements about these 84 different "tribes." But it is clear that the commissioners' list has been compiled from imperfectly kept and still more imperfectly spelled Spanish records. The confusion into which they and others have fallen in reference to the so-called "tribes" is due to the fact that our country is divided not only into provinces, but into provincial districts, wherein slightly different dialects are spoken. The inhabitants of these provincial districts have been confused with the few mountain peoples. The latter have been subdivided by purely artificial boundaries, by which means a small community has been subdivided into two or more "tribes." Additional "tribes" have also been created by the incorrect spelling of local Spanish officials, and by giving two native equivalents for the same people, as, for instance, when two "tribes" are created by calling the one Buquils and the other Buquiles, which is equivalent to saying that there are two "tribes" in England, the English and the British.

Examining the list still more in detail, we find that there are said to be two tribes of Aetas, two more of Attas, and one of Atas. These are not tribes at all. The word "Aeta" is the Tagalog equivalent of "Negrito." This word has been spelled in three different ways by careless Spanish officials, and thus multiplied by the commissioners into three separate and distinct "tribes." The word "Baluga" is another native equivalent for the Negritos, and this word is also given by the commission as the name of a separate and distinct "tribe." It would be just as absurd to regard the Americans as one tribe and the "Yankees" as another, and then to increase these two tribes into four or more by misspelling the word "Americans," or by translating it into French.

The names are also given of "tribes" which do not exist in the Philippines at all, as, for instance, the Manguanes of Masbate, the Manguanes of Ticao, the Negritos of Tayabas. I have been in all of these places, but I never saw or heard of these "tribes," nor have I ever met anyone who had seen or heard of them.

Thus, by the processes of imagination, bad spelling, translation, subdivision, and multiplication, the 15,000 Negritos are split up into 21 "tribes."

There are also said to be 16 Indonesian "tribes" in the island of Mindanao. It would be interesting to know where the commissioners obtained this information. The interior of Mindanao has never been explored; all that is known of it with any degree of certainty is that the inhabitants are Indonesians, and that they are divided into sections under small chiefs or headmen.

It would be impossible, in the time at my disposal, to even attempt to explain all the errors and confusions of this list prepared by the Schurman commission. It is sufficient to say that by the processes which I have indicated the few semicivilized people and the civilized inhabitants of the provincial districts in Luzon and the Visayas have been multiplied into 84 "tribes."

Now, as a native of the country, and as one who has given some attention to the ethnography of the archipelago, both by personal research and by a study of the best works on the subject, I may be permitted to give a brief statement of the facts.

There has been a considerable amount of speculation about the Negritos, who are erroneously regarded as the aboriginal inhabitants of the whole archipelago. But Pedro A. Paterno, one of our most capable ethnologists, and others have shown that the Negritos are the surviving remnant of the slaves brought to our islands by the Moros in the eleventh and subsequent centuries. They are not especially negroid in appearance, and only those inhabiting the province of Bataan in Luzon have curly hair.

In the large and only partially explored island of Mindanao there are several Indonesian "tribes," the chief of which are the Subanos, estimated to

number from fifty to seventy thousand; the Mendayas, who are estimated to number 35,000; and the Tagabauas, comprising about 30,000. The Mendayas and the Manobos are said to practice, the one human sacrifice, and the other ceremonial cannibalism.

But the evidence of this is conflicting and untrustworthy. It is also said that the small "tribe" of 4,000 Ilongotes in Luzon are head-hunters. This has been denied and asserted on equally untrustworthy authority. I have never met or heard of anyone who had witnessed any of these practices. The information has always come from a neighboring people. The idea has probably arisen by travelers having seen the heads of criminals erected on spears, just as one might have witnessed the same thing a century or two ago on Temple Bar or London Bridge.

But if that proved head-hunting on the part of Ilongotes, it also proves that the English people were head-hunters.

If, however, these statements are true, they are paralleled by the scalp-hunting Indians of the United States and by the human sacrifices and ceremonial cannibalism of the Canadian Indians.

There are, also, the Moros of Mindanao and the Sulus. They are, of course, Mohammedans, and some of their institutions are contrary to the true ideals of morality and liberty.

There are a few natives on Mindoro who have not been Christianized nor tyrannized by Spain.

But they have a religion and a code of morals of their own, the latter of which they adhere to and which in many respects is superior to that practiced by the Spaniards. They believe in one God and are monogamists. They are a moral and hospitable people who do their duty to their fellow-man, worship God in their own way, and do not believe in any kind or form of devil.

The so-called wild men of Luzon are the Igorrotes, who are "a warlike but semicivilized people, living in villages, owning farms and cattle, irrigating their rice fields, mining and working gold and copper and forging swords and spear heads of iron," but who have never been converted to Christianity or subdued by Spain.

They are, however, prepared to submit to and recognize Aguinaldo's government and have sent him presents of gold dust to assist in the war. The Igorrotes are probably an early branch of the Malayan race which originally populated the island.

These uncivilized and semicivilized people are not separate genealogical tribes. The inhabitants of Mindanao are a homogeneous people of common Indonesian descent, who have become divided into sections under petty chiefs or headmen, some of which have slight differences of dialect which have arisen gradually owing to there being little or no intercommunication. But most of them speak the same dialect.

Let us now glance very briefly at the remaining millions of Filipinos, who are generally regarded as belonging to the Malayan race.

They constitute more than nineteen-twentieths of the entire population of the archipelago, and are divided into provincial districts inhabited by the Visayans, the Tagalogs, the Bicolos, the Ilocanos, the Pangasinans, the Pampangans, and the Cagayans. All of these provincial people belong to one race, and all of them are Christian people practicing the morals and arts of civilization and speaking dialects which are as similar to each other as are the dialects of the different provinces in England. The divergence between these dialects is much less than that between the Spanish and the Italian languages. I have traveled alone in Italy. I do not know Italian, but I have had no difficulty in understanding and in making myself understood by the Italians.

Similarly, I have traveled in the Visayas and elsewhere in the Philippines and have had very much less difficulty in communicating with the Visayans and the Bicolos. A Tagalog will become proficient in the Visayan or other dialects within a fortnight, and vice versa.

As a matter of fact, the difference between the dialects of the seven provincial districts would not be a real difficulty to independent self-government. First, because the difference is so slight, and secondly, because Spanish is the official language of our country, spoken by the educated people of all provinces; and, as the Schurman commission declares, these educated people are far more numerous than is generally supposed. When Tagalogs, or Visayans, or Bicolos meet they never dream of speaking in their own dialects; intercourse between them is carried on in Spanish.

And I may state parenthetically that the Filipinos have so excelled in Spanish as to have won valuable literary prizes in competition with the Spaniards themselves. Dr. José Rizal, at the age of 17, took the first prize in the Cervantes literary competition at Manila, which was open to Spaniards and Filipinos alike in both Spain and the Philippines.

But if the language were a difficulty under Filipino rule it would be a still greater difficulty under American rule, due to the necessity of the introduction of English, which would form a third language in our islands.

Other countries do not find that a difference in language forms a difficulty to self-government. In every country in the world, with perhaps the exception of the United States, there are two or more languages or dialects spoken by the people.

The only difficulty with regard to language in any of these countries has been due to jealousy as to which language should become the official one. This difficulty has already been settled in the Philippines.

Now, as to the supposed enmity between the so-called "tribes." Such enmity is quite unknown among our people. There may be, and no doubt there is, enmity between individuals, but the enmity does not exist between the so-called "tribes" or provinces. During the short term when our government was not interfered with the most perfect harmony and unanimity existed, and provincial and racial differences were never even thought of.

When our government was first established emissaries came from almost all the provinces and islands declaring their support on behalf of those from whom they came. Even the Moros of Mindanao and Igorrotes of North Luzon, who had never been subdued by Spain, acclaimed Aguinaldo, and were prepared to recognize his government.

Our "asamblea" or representative chamber, under the new constitution, comprised representatives of all the provinces. Some of these provinces include two or more islands, while some islands are divided into two or more provinces. Thus the province of Romblon includes the islands of Romblon, Tablas, Sibuyan, and other smaller islands, whilst Panay is divided into four and Luzon into many provinces. It should be remembered that these provinces are separated by artificial boundaries. They are geographical but not racial areas. Frequently in one province two dialects are used, as in North Camarines, where Tagalog and Bicol are spoken. On the other hand, in some cases two or more provinces use only one dialect, as in the 13 provinces where Tagalog is spoken. A Spaniard or other foreigner can not distinguish any difference in the accent of the inhabitants of these 13 provinces, although a native may in some cases, but not in all, be able to tell whether a speaker is from, say, Batangas or Bulacan. But to imagine that the inhabitants of these provinces generally are at enmity with each other, or that they would be likely to tear one another's throats, is as absurd as to suppose that the inhabitants of Massachusetts would naturally desire to rend the men of New Hampshire or Rhode Island.

The interrelations of the people of the several provincial districts show that no such enmity has existed or does now exist. For instance, in the



schools and colleges, especially in Manila, there are representatives of all the chief provincials, and it would be impossible to tell which were which. I may be pardoned for here referring to myself. I am a Tagalog; but it would be impossible for another Filipino to say, judging from external appearance only, whether I was a Bicol, a Visayan, a Tagalog, or a Pangasinan. The only way of discovering from which provincial district I came would be by means of the dialect.

There are many institutions in the Philippines the benefits of which are not confined to the people of any one province. For example, there is an educational institution (purely Filipino) granting scholarships which enable the winners to study in Europe. These scholarships are open to all Filipinos in the archipelago.

In Japan the official representative of the so-called "Tagalog despotism" is an Ilocano. In Madrid all the Filipinos have formed themselves into a committee and are working unitedly for independence. The president of the committee is a Bicol, the vice-president an Ilocano, the secretary a Visayan, the treasurer a Tagalog, and the remainder of the committee are Tagals, Visayans, Bicolos, Ilocanos, and Pangasinans. In Barcelona, in Paris, and in London the same diversity of province and the same unanimity of purpose obtain. Among all the Filipinos resident in Europe who represent the educated and moneyed classes, and who know something of European methods of government, there is not one "Americanista."

This is an important fact, because all these men are entirely free from the supposed despotism of Aguinaldo or General MacArthur. They are thus free from all external influences; yet every one of them has voluntarily chosen to support Aguinaldo and to work for the independence of our country.

As a matter of fact, with the exception of the few uncivilized tribes in central Mindanao and the Sulus, and the semicivilized Igorrotes and Negritos of Luzon to which I have referred, the Filipinos are a homogeneous people belonging to the Malayan race. They speak several dialects, but they are one people. They constitute an overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the Philippines. They are opposed not solely to American, but to any foreign rule; and they are united in the desire for independence and for the purpose of maintaining a stable, independent government.

In conclusion, I again assert, without fear of contradiction, that the alleged antagonisms between the inhabitants of the provincial districts, or between the so-called "tribes," have arisen, not in the minds of the Filipinos themselves, but in the minds of those who do not understand our peoples and who have reached conclusions in no way warranted by the facts.

I have also been asked to say a word about a so-called "tribe" not included in the commissioners' list. It has been stated that "the Macabebes are fighting on the American side." The statement has been made in a manner which would convey the idea that the Macabebes are a large tribe, somewhat like the Tagalogs, and that it is therefore clear that all the Filipinos do not desire native rule. You will no doubt be surprised to learn that the Macabebes, or Macabebians, as they should be called, are simply the inhabitants of the town of Macabebe, in Pampanga.

The population of this town has been estimated at from four to ten thousand, all told, and of these only 200 are scouting for the American forces. If that shows disunity on the part of 10,000,000 of Filipinos—well, "make the most of it!"

I should like to mention that these same Macabebians also fought for Spain against the Filipinos in the insurrection of 1896. Apparently they prefer foreign rule of any kind, whether it be Spanish or American, to that of their own. We are glad, therefore, that such men as these are not fighting on our side.

SIXTO LOPEZ.

As showing that their desire is for justice and not for charity, I further supplement my remarks by the letter of the gentleman last named to Rev. Dr. Hale, dated February 7, 1901:

DEAR SIR: In the Boston Transcript of January 17 there is mention of a project to provide "practical help for the Filipinos" by "sending them farming implements and seeds, which they much need as a means toward gaining a livelihood." It is further stated that the project was set on foot by Miss Sarah E. Hunt, at the request of an American officer in the Philippines; that it has the approval of Governor W. Murray Crane and yourself, and that you, as president of the Lend-a-Hand Society, have been good enough to send out circulars asking for contributions.

While admitting that this movement is prompted by the best motives and kindest feelings, I must, in so far as I can speak on behalf of my fellow-countrymen, respectfully decline the proffered aid. In doing so, let me say that I feel sure if you only knew the real conditions in the Philippines you would not offer this indignity to a people who are silently suffering misery and death in defense of their rights, but who will not accept the bounty of any foreign nation; least of all of the nation that is causing the misery.

If the Filipinos were only freed from this terrible curse of "benevolent assimilation" and left in peace to continue the beneficent government which they themselves instituted two years ago, they would not need the charity which I am sure they will now politely but firmly decline.

It is said that the present policy in the Philippines is an imperialist policy. Upon that I here offer no opinion. But this I know: It has always been the policy of imperialism to give charity while it withholds justice; it has always been the custom of peoples freeing themselves from tyranny to demand justice and refuse charity. In this the Filipinos are not an exception. They do not shrink from suffering when honor demands it. They are not as exercised about an empty dinner pail as some persons seem to be about a full one. Better to have gnawing hunger with self-respect than surfeit with shame. Better to be a starving Filipino asking for liberty than a descendant of Washington denying it.

We do desire an amelioration of these conditions of misery and horror. We desire it on behalf of the patriot fighting against a reincarnation of the principles of George III, and on behalf of the wife and mother whose stifled cry may never reach the ear of pity in America. But we will accept that amelioration only from the hands of justice. That which is ours by right we will not accept in charity. Give us justice, and we ourselves will be able to attend to the wants of our people.

The Filipinos are described by competent authorities as "excellent agriculturists." Improvement in some of their methods is possible, and they know it. But let me be fair. It is possible—as the unknown officer writes to Miss Hunt—that there are "natives digging with bamboo sticks and scooping the earth up with their hands when repairing roads" for the American forces. This is a new kind of agriculture. No doubt it will result in more digging—of graves! It is also possible that these misguided natives—the only class with whom the officer comes in contact, and from whom he receives his utterly erroneous impressions and information—may be willing to accept charity. If the lend-a-hand society desires to help them, be it so. But let each parcel of seeds and each implement be addressed to those who are building roads with hands of shame in order that their own brethren may be shot.

If I were permitted a suggestion, it would be this: Let the money received from the generous donors be applied, with their permission, to purchasing and supplying to every person in the United States a copy of the Declaration

of Independence, with the third paragraph printed in large capitals. This rare old seed, so long hidden away in neglected barns, might thus bring forth fruit that would bless both your country and mine—yours with honor, mine with liberty and peace.

I am taking the liberty of writing this in the form of an open letter, because I desire that it should have the same publicity as the appeal in the Boston Transcript.

With every assurance of my respect and my appreciation of your intended kindness, sincerely yours,

SIXTO LOPEZ.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 7, 1901.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that all members may have an opportunity to print remarks on this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I beg to say a word about the special provisions of these amendments. First, we ask Cuba to agree to maintain her independence and her territory against all foreign countries. That is the Monroe doctrine. We have the right to enforce this. Second, we ask Cuba not to make herself the slave of any foreign country by a public debt which she can not pay. That is also really the Monroe doctrine, because it is necessary to its enforcement, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] admitted this.

Third, we ask Cuba to consent that we may intervene to preserve her independence against foreign nations. That is also the Monroe doctrine, and is our guaranty to her of the very independence which we have given her.

We likewise ask Cuba to consent that we may intervene to maintain republican government. This is a guaranty of liberty, the same guaranty of a republican form of government that the United States gives to every free State of this Union.

We also ask Cuba to agree that she will discharge the obligations which were imposed by the treaty of Spain with the United States, and that we may enforce this agreement.

There is not time in the three minutes remaining to go over these obligations in detail.

They include such fundamental rights as the protection of the property of Spaniards, their free exercise of their religion, their right to fair trial in the courts, and the right of Spain to send consuls. These treaty rights we must demand of Cuba to assume.

It was agreed by the treaty that we should occupy the island for a time, that we should perform these obligations while in such occupancy, and that on its termination we would advise any government that should be established to assume these obligations.

Now, when we ourselves have assumed the responsibility of establishing that government, the right of advice becomes a duty, and to require performance of these obligations is nothing but justice.

We ask Cuba (fifth) for sanitation. This is necessity, and above all law. Self-preservation, Mr. Speaker, is not only the first law of nature, but sanitation is humanity to the people of Cuba as well as to ourselves. We ask Cuba (seventh) to give us coaling stations. This is for her own defense, for the Navy will be the only defense of the Pearl of the Antilles against the desire of foreign nations.

The provisions of this bill are well drawn as to Cuba. They are for her liberty and not against it. We could not improve them.

Let us turn to the Philippines for a minute. There we find 80 different tribes with 20 different languages, different habits and customs, different institutions, and different conditions, so that there is civilization in one place and semibarbarism in others. Each place may need a different form of government as its laws and customs differ, and the establishment of such governments, with officers, municipal, judicial, executive, or legislative, is not a matter for code legislation, but must, for the present, be lodged in the Chief Executive.

This was the rule of the common law, that mother of free institutions. It was the chief executive which established republican government among us, and established the legislatures of the colonies which became these United States. The establishment of free institutions by the Executive is no dream. It is history; it is practical, and it is a necessity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave of the House for that purpose I submit the following in extension in the RECORD of what I said more briefly in the House.

The principles of the Cuban and Philippine provisions of this bill are those that make for liberty and are required by our own pledged faith; and I am not sorry that my time to speak was short if I was thereby induced to state them so briefly that he who runs may read.

These provisions establish the guaranties of liberty and republican self-government that we have pledged to Cuba, and they grant to the Philippines the inestimable privilege of receiving civil government, as fast as circumstances will permit, by the mere act



of the Executive, without waiting for ponderous legislation by a Congress 11,000 miles away. They are for liberty in each case.

It is not without reason that those who have attacked these provisions have not quoted them and have indulged in wild attacks, talk about tyranny, and breach of faith and violation of Cuban independence. We favor these provisions, because they guard that independence, carry out our plighted faith, and enable the necessary tyranny of military rule to be changed as soon as may be into government by law.

We challenge those who make these attacks to find one word in these provisions to the contrary. They bear the minutest scrutiny.

We have declared that the people of Cuba are and ought to be free and independent. We mean to carry out that declaration and protect her against any foes of that independence. Beyond question, there are such foes. The pearl of the Antilles has been the long-coveted prize of the world. Her fertile soil, her abounding minerals, her balmy clime, her commanding position, her sheltered ports that nature itself has fortified, her domination of the mid sea of the Western Hemisphere and of the isthmus that will soon be a gateway of the world's commerce—all those considerations make every foreign nation covet her.

The mere declaration of the Monroe doctrine and that the United States would not permit European aggression on the American Continent has sufficed to protect most of the mainland. But it did not protect Central America against settlements which will yet be a thorn in our side. England in Nicaragua and France in Panama are standing examples of the folly of bare declaration.

The Monroe doctrine did not hinder foreign nations from going into Mexico, nor induce them to withdraw, until they saw that doctrine supported by the veteran hosts of both sides of the civil war. Cuban independence and the Monroe doctrine must stand and fall together. They are not merely to be declared, but to be maintained, as well against open force as against secret machination, bribery, intrigue, and all the means that great empires use on weak and especially new-born States. We are determined that the wiles that have bought or conquered the East Indies are not to be used in the West, and the right of America to secure this, and to maintain Cuban independence and the Monroe doctrine, is therefore to be so recognized by Cuba itself that Europe shall never put it in dispute.

Could any less be asked? Yet this is all that is done by this bill. It bears detailed examination. There is nothing of it that is not directed to these objects and these alone.

This is the express statement of the bill, that it is for the recognition of the independence of Cuba and in order to leave the government of Cuba to its people, in fulfillment of our declaration in 1898, viz:

*Provided further,* That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled, "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people."

This is our act, and we are to withdraw when a government shall be established which shall recognize the principles before stated, viz—

so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

First, that Cuba will maintain its independence and her territory and population against foreign domination.

#### I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

What is this but protection? What but the American Monroe doctrine?

The second provision is to the same end—that she shall not become the bond servant of any other country by contracting a debt that she can not pay.

#### II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

The distinguished gentleman on the other side of the House [Mr. COCHRAN] has expressed this far better than I can in this very debate:

I concur in the views of many of my colleagues, who have declared in my presence that in respect to several matters of the utmost importance it is the duty of this Government, and its right, to have something to say as to the affairs of Cuba.

News comes from Cuba that no objection will be interposed to a stipulation guarding this country against the danger of treaties with foreign

countries inimical to the interests of the United States. I am glad to know this, for I unhesitatingly declare that it is not only the right but the duty of this country to supervise the foreign power relations of the island in such a way and to such an extent as will save Cuba from embroilment with foreign powers. I think that we should see to it also that Cuba shall contract no debts or obligations of a nature or in quarters which might in the future imperil her safety.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago the German Emperor sent a man-of-war to the island of Santo Domingo as the bearer of a sight draft against the Government of that island. Bombardment and invasion were threatened, and the poor islanders were compelled to pay the claim. Five or six years ago Nicaragua was invaded by the English and a similar outrage was perpetrated there. Are these cases to be regarded as precedents?

Our Government made no protest, and so the proceeding was at least tacitly approved at Washington. It may be said the claims were just, but who knows they were just? The little Republics thus assailed demanded arbitration, and the fact that it was refused is some evidence that they were robbed.

The United States is bound by the highest considerations to safeguard Cuba against similar complications; for, Mr. Speaker, any attempt of a foreign power to repeat in Cuba the proceedings in Santo Domingo and Nicaragua to which I have referred would not be tolerated by the United States. To put it plainly, whatever would endanger Cuba in the future is of interest to the people of the United States, and it is only reasonable that we should seek to throw about the island such safeguards as are manifestly necessary to her safety.

Third. To protect Cuban independence, to maintain a republican government, and to carry out the treaty of Paris, we claim a right of intervention.

#### III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

This right of intervention is not against the liberties of Cuba. It is necessary for their preservation. It is the same right that we exercised in Mexico. The United States guarantees republican government to the free States of the Union under the Constitution, and it would intervene in State affairs, if necessary, to maintain that guarantee against anarchy or tyranny. This clause of the Constitution is no infringement of the liberties of the State, but the contrary. The like clause is also as to Cuba.

The remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] apply fully to this clause.

By the treaty of Paris the United States agreed that Spanish citizens in Cuba should be protected in life, religion, property, and civil rights, especially in the courts. These rights are by our plighted faith, as well as in accordance with the just and equitable provisions of the law of nations.

Articles IX to XV of the treaty state them in detail.

#### ARTICLE IX.

Spanish subjects, natives of the peninsula, residing in the territory over which Spain by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such territory or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce, and professions, being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners. In case they remain in the territory they may preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain by making, before a court of record, within a year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, a declaration of their decision to preserve such allegiance; in default of which declaration they shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside.

The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

#### ARTICLE X.

The inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

#### ARTICLE XI.

The Spaniards residing in the territories over which Spain by this treaty cedes or relinquishes her sovereignty shall be subject in matters civil as well as criminal to the jurisdiction of the courts of the country wherein they reside, pursuant to the ordinary laws governing the same; and they shall have the right to appear before such courts and to pursue the same course as citizens of the country to which the courts belong.

#### ARTICLE XII.

Judicial proceedings pending at the time of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty in the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be determined according to the following rules:

1. Judgments rendered either in civil suits between private individuals or in criminal matters, before the date mentioned, and with respect to which there is no recourse or right of review under the Spanish law, shall be deemed to be final, and shall be executed in due form by competent authority in the territory within which such judgments should be carried out.

2. Civil suits between private individuals which may on the date mentioned be undetermined, shall be prosecuted to judgment before the court in which they may then be pending, or in the court that may be substituted therefor.

3. Criminal actions pending on the date mentioned before the supreme court of Spain against citizens of the territory which by this treaty ceases to be Spanish shall continue under its jurisdiction until final judgment; but, such judgment having been rendered, the execution thereof shall be committed to the competent authority of the place in which the case arose.

#### ARTICLE XIII.

The rights of property secured by copyrights and patents acquired by Spaniards in the island of Cuba and in Porto Rico, the Philippines, and other ceded territories at the time of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty shall continue to be respected. Spanish scientific, literary, and artistic works, not subversive of public order in the territories in question, shall continue to be admitted free of duty into such territories for the period of ten years, to be reckoned from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty.



## ARTICLE XIV.

Spain shall have the power to establish consular officers in the ports and places of the territories, the sovereignty over which has been either relinquished or ceded by the present treaty.

## ARTICLE XV.

The Government of each country will, for the term of ten years, accord to the merchant vessels of the other country the same treatment in respect of all port charges, including entrance and clearance dues, light dues, and tonnage duties, as it accords to its own merchant vessels, not engaged in the coastwise trade.

This article may at any time be terminated on six months' notice given by either Government to the other.

The last article is a merely temporary arrangement.

Now, it is true that we limited our obligations to the time of our occupancy, agreeing only to advise the Cuban government to assume them at the termination of that occupancy.

## ARTICLE XVI.

It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will upon the termination of such occupancy advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations.

When that article was framed it was claimed that there was an independent Cuban government in existence, with its president, legislature, and courts, a government which we were aiding and whose action we could not control. We likened our intervention to that of France in the American revolution. The similitude has failed. We have found it our duty to help create a new civil government in Cuba, and under these circumstances our right of advice has become a duty to see that the new government assumes these obligations, for they are already historically part of its constitution—the conditions of its existence, treaty landmarks bought by the blood of Americans in the work of rescue of Cuba from the Spanish yoke.

So are the rights which have accrued during our occupancy, and which Cuba is to respect.

## IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

There is one topic that has been forced on us as a matter of necessity. We can no more tolerate the yellow fever in Habana than we could the protection by its government of a nest of pirates making war upon mankind. Steam has brought that port too near to us for the comfortable enforcement of weeks of quarantine. We therefore make proper sanitation a matter of treaty agreement, to be conducted on plans already devised or to be agreed upon. Be it that the provision is unusual, I admit it. But it is necessary most of all to that part of the United States chiefly represented by members who oppose this bill, but from whom I have yet to hear a word of protest as to this provision. Civilization itself demands that a nation or city shall not become a breeder of any plague that can be prevented.

We ask, therefore—

## V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

The provision as to the Isle of Pines is a mere reservation of a question of boundary for further settlement. It was always a question and a fair question.

## VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

The foregoing discussion explains the important provision for coaling stations. The defense of Cuba against any foreign power must be by a fleet. Who can forget when our blockade of Santiago was almost broken by a rough sea, so that we had to contemplate going to Key West to coal? Other nations have coaling stations in the Gulf of Mexico. The United States have none, and the possession of such stations is essential to her ability to maintain Cuban independence against any foreign navy and to protect her own Navy there.

It is therefore provided:

## VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

Unless the United States have these stations, Cuban harbors would be a mere shelter to foreign fleets. What would strong nations care for the neutrality of our ward? If we would be guardian we must be able to protect.

It is for mutual protection and in order to the guarantee of liberty and law in Cuba and its full and plighted independence that we ask that these provisions be embodied in its constitution and in treaty with the United States.

## VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

By such a treaty the United States also becomes bound. It recites the act of 1898. It reaffirms our pledge. It binds us to the objects mentioned in these provisions, and especially to the guaranty of liberty, independence, and republican government against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

But we are told that these provisions should not have been first formulated by us.

The gentleman from Missouri, whom I have quoted, says that their formulation during the session of the Cuban constitutional convention is an insult, and that we "suspend over the heads of the delegates to the Habana convention as a menace the sword of a dictator;" that the threat of intervention endangers peace, and that we multiply the difficulties of the convention by these provisions.

I do not think that calm reflection will so regard the matter. These matters are vital to the welfare of Cuba. They are vital to the Monroe doctrine. They can not be too soon formulated. Do gentlemen urge that we should let the Cuban convention adjourn, and then step in afterwards to demand a new assembling of the convention to agree to these necessary provisions? Are we to bid against foreign nations for the right of guardianship, for coaling stations, sanitation, and the needs of the hour? Are we to turn the lamb loose to the company of the lion and the bear, confident that we can win her back to the fold by waving the flag? We owe a duty to her. We owe a duty, also, to America—not to ourselves only, but to the continent that is under theegis of our protection.

We disclaim sovereignty. We pledge to Cuba full independence. But it is a necessary and historical condition of that independence that she shall help America in its self-protection. We think it more honest to be frank and true. All that we ask is for Cuban welfare. We are friends, and between friends there shall be no concealment. Nor can misunderstanding last. It needed only such a frank statement as this to remove doubt as to our intentions in this all too tempting island, and to assure its people that Congress as well as the President stand by their pledge, and that America renews its troth and trust to maintain the independence that its sons have achieved.

What the future may bring we know not. Cuba is too close to the United States not to desire the most intimate trade relations that will build up the island with American capital. This treaty will be but the prelude to many more—desired by both. It does not go into the particulars; that must be the free agreement of both. It includes only those fundamental articles which are part of the constitution of the island, settled by history, settled by our pledges and responsibility, settled by treaty and necessity, and settled by the lives of our sons.

This bill provides further that the President may establish civil governments in the Philippines and maintain and protect the inhabitants in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion until Congress shall legislate on the subject.

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

These are the powers which were conferred upon the President as to Louisiana and again as to Florida. The precedents have been many times referred to.

This act is guarded by many new and careful restrictions. Franchises are to be repealable; full reports to be made to each session of Congress; public lands, timber, and mining rights are not to be sold, leased, or disposed of; no franchises shall be granted that are not immediately and absolutely necessary, and all franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of permanent civil government. These restrictions are as follows:

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago full reports shall be made to Congress on or before the first day of each regular session of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof; and full reports of the acts and doings of said government, and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people, shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing for a more permanent government: *Provided*, That no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon or the mining rights therein shall be made: *And provided further*, That no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States, and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which can not, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.

It may be fairly maintained that such a provision as this is absolutely essential to the establishment of government in these islands. It is idle for the leaders on the other side to insist that this is the establishment of tyranny, because it is the same law under which free governments have been established by Democratic



Presidents under the authority of Democratic Congresses. The only difference is that this act is guarded by restrictions, which do not exist under these precedents.

It is fair to say, also, that this is the only way in which civil government can be simply and well established. Government must precede legislation. There is no body of men as numerous as the population of these islands which have not laws of their own to be administered. Such administration is the duty of the Executive. We owe it to our free institutions that military government should cease as soon as may be and government by law should take its place. We must therefore authorize the Executive to appoint officers, who shall establish courts and administer the laws as they find them or as they have been necessarily altered by the changed relations of these islands. Our own history shows this exact policy.

The thirteen original colonies received their self-government in exactly the same way—not from the legislature of England, but from its Executive. Some had charters granted by the Crown. Others had legislatures elected under proclamation. My own State and the great State of New York administered their governments under proclamations of Queen Anne, which appointed a governor, commanded the election of a legislative assembly by the freeholders, established courts at law with all the powers of the great law courts in England, and ordered the administration therein of the law of England so far as applicable to the colony, as well as of such laws as should be duly passed by the colonial legislature. It is from such proclamations or charters that the original States have received their free institutions, and have passed them on to the States which have been since formed.

It is likewise interesting to observe that the complaints of our forefathers were universally directed, not to the action of the Executive in establishing such governments, but to the action of the English legislature in attempting to interfere with them. Let us benefit by this experience. There are laws and institutions now existing in the Philippines. Every man there who has property or is engaged in trade must desire the establishment as soon as possible of officers, who shall execute those laws. They demand government by law as one of the rights of man. Such government, so instituted by the President, will be according to customs and rules which they understand, modified only by the great principles of freedom which guard our courts, protect the administration of justice in criminal cases, and make for the liberty of the citizen.

It is to be remembered also that there are not one, but many islands in the Philippines, and not one nation, but many tribes, with different languages, institutions, and laws. Yet our friends on the other side object to a provision which enables the President to send proper officers to each locality to see to the administration of these laws. They ask, on the contrary, that Congress, without knowledge on the subject, and with the blindness which we must have as to the conditions affecting men of other races in another clime, scattered over various islands, in another hemisphere, should nevertheless attempt to make codes of law for them, which are as likely as not to be repugnant to every condition to which they are used and to be subversive of the whole system of jurisprudence with which they are familiar, while they are certain to be unsuitable to the various conditions prevailing in the different parts of these islands.

The provisions of this bill make no such fatal mistake as this. They provide for the establishment of that civil government to which the islanders have a right. It will be a government of law. It will be subject to change by Congress, if change become necessary; but the example of parliamentary interference with the American colonies renders it desirable that such Congressional interference shall be exercised with discretion. We may better trust the men of these islands to work out their own free institutions under the guidance of the patriot who now sits in the chair of the President, and under the general regulations for protection and freedom that will be established there, as they have been established wherever the government exists under the American flag.

Let us not think, however, that Congress has nothing to do. It has much to do. We must establish our trade with the Philippines upon such a basis as will bind them to us by ties of affection and with bars of steel. Trade brings men closer than bayonets or laws. We must in time by law turn the temporary government into one that is permanent. But we can not act hastily.

It is a curious contrast that those who have been urging that we should let the Philippines have nominal independence under the military tyranny of Aguinaldo should now wish to bind them hand and foot with American-made codes.

This bill gives them real independence. It refrains from inflicting upon them foreign legislation, leaving them to be governed by their own laws, modified only by such changes as shall be made by those who know their wants and are on the ground. Perhaps soon those changes will be made by representative bodies elected by themselves. Our friends are mistaken when they think,

or at least call, this bill a measure of tyranny. It is a measure of necessary administration. It is likewise a measure by which the Philippines are allowed to go on for themselves in the path of progress. Those who desire Congressional legislation are rather the promoters of tyranny, for Congress would be making laws without knowing the conditions, and there is no tyrant like ignorance.

We support the provisions of this bill both as to Cuba and the Philippines. Those provisions are timely. They are necessary. They recognize existing needs; they enable the settling of civil government, and they give proper powers, in the interest of law and liberty, into the hand of that servant of liberty and law who fills the office of President of the United States.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, had the gentleman from Michigan not addressed the House I should have contented myself by sitting in silence during this debate. But I can not agree to the view which he takes of these resolutions. If I gave to them the meaning and tendency which he attributes to them, I should have no hesitation in voting "no." If I thought that there was hidden in the language of the resolutions the purpose to accomplish the results he desires and advocates, I should have no hesitation in voting "no."

I do not understand that the Senate amendment is in the nature of an ultimatum; rather in the nature of a proposal, which we hope the people of Cuba, in the interest of our country and theirs, may accept. It authorizes the President, under the conditions named, to deliver the island, now under our military rule, to the control and government of its people. It is not necessarily the final word. We are dealing, as the gentleman from Ohio well said, with the present—the duty of to-day.

I am one of those who voted for the first time in the affirmative upon any of the Cuban resolutions, for the resolutions as they finally passed the House of Representatives. I had steadily voted against all declarations upon the subject of Cuba up to the House resolutions which were finally adopted. I believe that the American Congress and the American people are bound in honor by that part of the resolution which is commonly called the Teller resolution. Whether it was wise or unwise, we gave our pledged word to the people of Cuba, to the people of the world, and to our own honor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that it is the ultimate duty of this country to fulfill that pledge to the letter. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] I realize the embarrassment which surrounds the occasion. I like not this method of legislation. It is "yes" or "no" upon many propositions with no qualifications. With no opportunity for amendment and little time for deliberation, how difficult it is to come to a proper conclusion which one may not regret in the end.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has well pointed out, there are many things in this amendment which are for the interest of this country and for the interest of Cuba alike. It may be that all the conditions prescribed are for her interest as well as ours. I realize that free and independent nations can not be built up in a day out of the ruins of centuries of despotism.

I persuade myself—and it is the only thing that induces me not to vote against the motion—I persuade myself that our action is but one step forward, and that a long one, in the accomplishment of our promise, that the plighted faith of Congress, the declaration of the Republican party, and the message of the President of the United States in God's good time will be fulfilled. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HULL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly impossible in the five minutes allotted to me to attempt any general discussion upon either of the amendments which have been proposed to the Army appropriation bill.

I can say in brief, however, that I indorse to the fullest extent in letter and in spirit the resolutions relating to the island of Cuba and those relating to the Philippine Islands. I regret that the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber in their discussion this afternoon upon the pending measure have not seen fit to point out substantial objections rather than indulge in invective.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Give us time and we will.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, we all know that there is no argument in abuse and no persuasion in vituperation. They have utterly failed to show that there is anything in this Philippine proposition that is unconstitutional and is not in accordance with the high and patriotic principles that have thus far governed and controlled the Republican party.

As my colleague from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] this afternoon pointed out, the resolutions are predicated upon a law more than one hundred years old, a law that was framed by the fathers of the Constitution for the purpose of extending liberty and the protection of law to our newly acquired possession, the Louisiana territory. This law, as I have said, is a substantial reproduction of that.

Mr. Speaker, as everybody familiar with history knows, President Jefferson appointed Governor Clayburn under the great



powers contained in that law to take possession of that territory. I want to ask my Democratic colleagues to-day if they are not willing to admit that his administration of the law was beneficial to the newly acquired possession and to the people that lived thereon?

Everybody knows that the people were unacquainted with our language, unfamiliar with our institutions, and that they hated our flag, and yet with legislation of that kind we developed these people until to-day they are among the most cultured and patriotic of the American citizens.

So, sir, will it be with the Philippine Islands and the Filipinos themselves. We must give them to-day such legislation as their character and their civilization warrant. The proposed legislation in this bill is better adapted to govern and control these people than it would be possible for us to frame should we take months to do it, because it puts it in the hands of the President to take trained men, familiar with the island, familiar with the character of the people, to legislate for them in accordance with the varying degrees of their civilization.

Now, one word further, Mr. Speaker, and I am done. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], when he was addressing the members of the House this afternoon, took occasion to denounce the President of the United States, and claimed that he had violated his pledge to the people.

I deny, Mr. Speaker, that he has violated any pledge given to the American people, or to the people of the world. I claim, as did the people in the November election, that every promise has been kept, every pledge has been fulfilled, and that his Administration will compare favorably with that of the Father of our Country and that of the sainted Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the most memorable declarations of one of the greatest patriots in this country—Patrick Henry—was, "By the light of the lamp of experience shall my feet be guided." That applies, Mr. Speaker, to nations as well as to individuals, and if we could but content ourselves to do—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which the United States troops are to be withdrawn from Cuba are contained in the amendment offered to the pending Army appropriation bill. It is now provided by the measure that the United States is to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people when they shall agree, either in their constitution or by ordinance, to eight provisions, which may be briefly summed up as follows:

First. No treaty inimical to the interests of the United States with any foreign power.

Second. No debt beyond the power of the island revenues to meet and cancel.

Third. The right of the United States to intervene whenever the independence of Cuba is threatened, and to maintain a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

Fourth. Acts of the United States during military administration to be ratified.

Fifth. Development of plans to prevent recurrence of epidemics.

Sixth. Isle of Pines to be omitted from Cuban boundaries until title thereto can be adjusted.

Seventh. The selling or leasing of land necessary for coaling or naval stations.

Eighth. A treaty embodying all these provisions.

This Cuban amendment, I think, will be upheld by the country. It meets a situation which is complicated and difficult, but the duty and wisdom of dealing with which far outweigh the considerations not to deal with it at all.

The amendment meets a situation which many wish did not exist, but which does exist, and which must be met.

The United States wrested Cuba from the clutch of a despotic Government which was converting the Pearl of the Antilles into a desolate island. At the cost of blood and treasure the United States undertook to give the Cuban people an opportunity to erect for themselves a government free and independent in conformity with a constitution which should meet their needs and requirements and insure peace, prosperity, and a permanent government. By this proposed amendment the United States demand guaranties as to the future of the island to promote these objects as much as to safeguard its own coasts from the dangers of hostile navies, which, in the course of events, might use Cuba, whether in alliance with a Cuban republic or by aggressive action, as a base of operation against ourselves. This the United States may well claim in all reason without compromising its conscience in the least.

There was no Cuban republic when this country went to war

with Spain, but when we swept Spain out of the West Indies we did so in conformity with the ardent prayers of the people of the island.

Notwithstanding this fact, the constitution recently adopted for the island by a convention of Cubans makes no mention of the obligation due from the islanders to the United States for their emancipation from Spanish rule, but, on the contrary, ignores the subject, while the Cuban politicians who are now in control do not hesitate to give out the most violent expressions of hatred for the United States and our people.

Recently at Habana and elsewhere on the island was celebrated the anniversary of the beginning of the revolution of 1895 against Spain. The occasion brought out in the public speeches to large assemblages the sentiments of the popular leaders, showing the bitterest animosity toward this country. Vigorous protests were made against the proposal to submit the new Cuban constitution to the United States Congress for sanction. The request of the United States for naval stations was denounced, and there was a general popular expression of impatience with all Cubans who suggested any agreement for mutual relations between the United States and the new republic.

In a meeting at the Tacon Theater, one Señor Zaya is reported to have gone so far as to blame the policy of intervention, which, he said, had not been beneficial to Cuba, had prevented progress, and caused unrest. The island, he insisted, must be a sovereign nation. Sovereignty lay in the machetes of its inhabitants. He said that the question of giving the United States naval stations on Cuban soil was being suggested. The only possible answer to this was a refusal. Cuba must be grateful to the United States, but she must not allow her gratitude to become servile, etc.

There were many other speeches in the same tenor. The new constitution establishes universal suffrage; it vests the political power in the hands of an ignorant and thriftless population, composed largely of negroes, in view of which fact the prospects of peace and prosperity for the newly enfranchised island would be poor were the United States to abandon Cuba at this time.

On the other hand, the property holding and commercial classes are greatly alarmed. There are on the files of the State Department confidential letters from substantial business men, not only in Habana but in all other large cities of the island, begging this country not to leave them at the mercy of the adventurers and professional patriots now influencing Cuban sentiment. These men say that when the United States resigns its authority the local officials, whose ideas of government are derived solely from their Spanish predecessors, will blackmail every business house, bank, and sugar plantation on the island; that life and property will be in danger.

This fear, it is said, amounts to a panic. The Spanish Government, while woefully corrupt, at least was capable of maintaining order in the commercial centers. No grounds exist for such a hope from a purely Cuban government. Upon the United States has devolved the responsibility of protecting life and property in the fulfillment of the conditions of the Paris treaty.

The withdrawal of all United States authority and force from Cuba at this time, in my opinion, will be the signal for trouble. In view of our blunder in passing both the Foraker amendment and the Teller resolution two years ago, I am opposed to the forcible annexation of the island of Cuba; but I recognize the duty of this Government to see that public order is maintained there, and that the protection to life and property guaranteed in the treaty of Paris to the people of the island be carried out. Cuba was surrendered to the United States. The United States, in accepting its cession, pledged due protection to the rights and lives and property of all its people. In transferring control of the island to the Cubans, or a dominating faction of them, the United States Government would not free itself of its pledge, its responsibility, its high duty.

Mr. Speaker, one of the chief reasons which justified this country's intervention to rescue Cuba from Spanish misrule is to be found in the fact that the deplorable sanitary condition of the island made it a dangerous nuisance.

It was like having an open cesspool opposite one's front door. The thing had to be abated. Its existence was a standing menace to the welfare of the American people. It involved them in periodic plagues which cost hundreds of lives, great financial loss, and brought business over a large part of the country to a standstill. It had to be gotten rid of.

At a very considerable expense of life and money we have gotten rid of it. By the application and enforcement of modern methods of sanitation at Habana and Santiago the scourge of yellow fever has been greatly mitigated—almost stamped out. It has now become the duty of the Congress to see to it that a return to the old condition of affairs be not permitted. This is a subject with regard to which there must be a special understanding between the United States and the Cuban republic of the future.

How this result can be accomplished if Cuba is to be an independent sovereignty is a problem not without its difficulties. If



the Cubans ever get to control things absolutely it is not unreasonable to assume that, in the light of the past, all the sanitary improvements which have been introduced will quickly go by the board. The Cubans did not want those improvements. They did not want to be clean and healthy. They opposed the American innovations in this respect as so many assaults upon their traditional privileges and personal freedom. They preferred the old way of doing things. They liked smells; they had a fondness for dirt; they resented the deprivations to which they were subjected.

If they are left quite free to do as they please they will return to the old state of things. Then the yellow-fever fiend will rage once more. This the Congress must prevent. It is one of the things that "Cuba libre" involves. It is unfortunate the Congress did not think of it from the start.

Whether the Cubans will accept or repel these amendments is of more interest than importance. They are acceptable to and will be accepted by the United States. They will be insisted upon by this country. The Cubans will do well also to accept them, for if they do not voluntarily agree to them they will be required involuntarily to conform to them. This Republic is done with nonsense. It accepts its responsibilities, and it recognizes alike the dominance of duty and the duty of dominance, wherever it is under contract with mankind to plant civilization, order, pacification, and reasonable liberty, firmly regulated by just and equal law.

What we ask of the Cubans is not unreasonable. It is consistent, in my opinion, with what should be accepted as the purpose and spirit of the Teller resolution. I concede that resolution has added to our embarrassment in dealing with this question. Could I cast a separate vote on each of the proposed amendments, I should have no hesitancy in voting for the Cuban amendment, and willingly would I shoulder my share of the responsibility of its adoption. I believe the welfare of this country demands the annexation of Cuba, sooner or later. It will have to come—by peaceful means, I trust—but if the Cuban spirit of to-day foretells their future attitude toward the United States, annexation will come as a result of conditions not of our making, and will to the Cubans prove their greatest blessing.

Mr. Speaker, the Philippine amendment to this appropriation bill confers upon the President extraordinary powers. It is a question whether the Parliament of England would confer so much power on King Edward. Certainly never was it contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that such sweeping autocratic, absolute, despotic power could or should be in the hands of the Congress to confer upon any one man or body of appointed men under the sanction and authority of that great declaration of principles and Bill of Rights. The Constitution provides that—

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Under this provision the Congress itself should take the initiative and act; it should not shirk its high responsibilities and endeavor to shift them by this attempted delegation of its great prerogatives to the Executive. Legislation such as this I believe beyond our authority and unconstitutional, a menace to our free institutions, an unjustifiable assault upon popular government, a challenge to the people of our country, because repudiating them.

Far be it from me to insinuate even that the Congress or the country has cause to question the ability, integrity, and patriotism of the President. His ambition must have been gratified by his reelection to the Presidency, and I entertain no doubt his aim is now to increase his reputation for statesmanship.

With me the question is, not whether the President is to be trusted, but whether under our form of government it is wise to make so serious a departure from our ancient landmarks and principles. Whether we should vest such power in any President. Once vested, this power will in due course be transmitted to the next President who may be less worthy.

Why does the other side set so much store by this resolution? Why is it necessary to tack it onto this appropriation bill in the shape of an amendment? It will give the President little power that he has not exercised as the Commander in Chief of the military forces of the United States in the Philippines. General MacArthur is responsible to him; the Taft Commission is of his creation and acts under his orders, and Judge Bates, of Vermont, who has just been appointed district judge of the Philippines, must serve under his authority.

Then why, by Congressional enactment, delegate such sweeping authority to the Executive? As an incident of the war he possesses all needed power and authority in the Philippines. This war is not won; it will still be waging when Congress convenes in December; in my belief it will be waging for years to come. If in this I am in error, if the islands shall be pacified before December next, the President, without the authority conveyed by the amendment, would still be able to deal with the Philippine question.

I deem it most unwise to intrust to any President full legisla-

tive, executive, and judicial powers; it is a dangerous precedent; it is contrary to a republican form of government; it is the very essence of imperialism. To authorize a dictatorship abroad is a long step toward its authorization at home. We must remain a government of the people, by the people, for the people—therein lies our national safety.

I do not believe there was ever much doubt in anybody's mind in this country—at least in the minds of any considerable percentage of those who have given the matter careful consideration—that American rule would be better for the Filipinos than any government they have ever had or can ever establish for themselves if permitted to make the experiment. The question has been and now is, whether a colonial system would not be a very bad thing for this country. In my opinion it certainly will be. However, there does not seem to be much to be accomplished by discussing that question now. It is almost a foregone conclusion that the United States will never give up the Philippines. The thing to do, therefore, is to shape our government of them so as to do ourselves the least possible harm and them the greatest possible good.

This Philippine amendment may do us great harm, and as its adoption is unnecessary, it should be stricken from the bill. A question of such great moment to the future of this country should have been thoroughly discussed instead of being disposed of by the Senate in a day or two, and in the House in a couple of hours under a compulsory rule, as if it were a matter of minor importance.

Ours is a government by the people. For the first time in our history it is proposed, by legislative and executive sanction, to make an individual supreme; true, now in the Philippines only. But where next? Who can answer?

Individual absolutism is not for us, nor is it for Congress to authorize as an annex to our governmental system. All force used by a government of the people must be used according to law and not according to personal whim and caprice. If the operation of the law is not just, those who suffer from it suffer from the injustice of the people, not from the tyranny of any person. Whenever it becomes apparent that this is the fact an appeal to the people will secure a change in the law. Under our system there is no ordinance, no statute, no charter, no constitution the people can not change. Under such conditions there is no reason for the use of violence to gain an end for which the law has provided or may be made to provide.

The requirement is that those whom the people intrust with the execution of the law shall perform their duty promptly and effectively. If any public officer fails to so execute the law, the people have power over him, as they have power over the law. Every public officer is responsible under the law to the people for the administration of his office. If he does not perform his duties honestly, intelligently, and economically, the people have the power to remove him or to refuse to reelect him, according to his offense. With supreme power over the law and over the administrators of the law, every person who disregards the law by any act is an enemy of the people, and should be so recognized by every well-wisher for the general welfare. When the people govern, there is no reason for irresponsible or lawless action by persons or mobs. Will the same be true when we shall have vested absolute power of life and death in one man?

This Philippine amendment substitutes in American territory individual irresponsible government for the people's government. The fact that our President is a safe man is an incident for which we have cause to rejoice; it should not, however, be considered a factor in weighing the merits of our proposed departure from ancient principles.

Mr. Speaker, aside from our indisposition, from political and economical reasons, to acquire the Philippine Islands, we of the minority have made our fight not from a desire to force independence on the Filipinos, but from a wish that those people should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves, unhampered by military control, the form of government acceptable to them.

Democrats hold that the acquisition of the Philippines was not an unavoidable result of our war with Spain and that if self-interest demanded it to-day we could withdraw our forces from the islands and leave the people to work out their own salvation. While we repudiate the idea that a consequence of our interference in Cuba must be the assumption by us and the working out of Spain's most difficult problem, it seems to me we can cease, now that the fight has gone against us, our opposition to the plans of the Administration and afford the President every aid in our power in his efforts to tranquilize the Philippines, without abating one jot of our opposition to the acquirement of colonial empires or of our right to question the continuance of the present relation in the future. I cast my vote for the Army reorganization bill for this reason, among others.

If the outcome of the policy now on trial shall be the voluntary acquiescence of the Filipinos in American rule, whatever form that rule may take, we are not bound even then to tie ourselves



to them. Whether we shall do so or not will depend on a favorable answer by the people to the question: Is it our duty and does it pay? Bearing in mind the enormous expenditure necessitated by them at present, and the admitted necessity for a continuance of this expenditure for a number of years, Democrats can afford to give the imperialists all the latitude they require. If the people become satisfied—duty does not enter into the question—and find the experiment does not pay, they will cut it short without any compunctions of conscience as to our manifest destiny in the premises.

Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the principle of the Philippine amendment to this bill, I desire to place myself on record. We are not permitted to vote upon the two amendments separately, but must vote for or against the bill in its entirety; therefore, in solemn protest I shall vote "no" on this measure, though gladly would I have voted "yes" had it not contained this obnoxious and dangerous Philippine rider.

Mr. SULZER. I yield half a minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

[Mr. BELLAMY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

[Mr. JETT addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

[Mr. FITZGERALD of New York addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES. The law of the United States as to acquired territory is this: The "existing" or old laws of the acquired territory remain unchanged, except those "found to be in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

This is clearly decided by our Supreme Court in two cases I have in mind: *Leitendorfer vs. Webb*, 1857 (20 How., p. 177), from which I have just quoted; and in a later case: *Chicago and Pacific Railroad vs. McGlinn* (114 U. S., 546).

That is the law, Mr. Speaker, and it is what the Republican party is now running away from, saying here to-day this is not the law. Thirsting for imperial power, they are studiously avoiding this law by assuming powers unheard of, contending that the Constitution is not in the Philippines and that the President can have—and this bill so provides—the power to legislate in these islands, when the power to legislate by the Constitution is lodged in Congress.

The Constitution ordains:

1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

This power can not be delegated (143 U. S., *Field vs. Clark*), but this amendment known as the Spooner provision undertakes to do so. It is unheard of as law. The Louisiana act of 1803 continued "existing" laws, and only "until the expiration of the present session of Congress," or before. It said it was temporary, and to be had under "existing" laws. This bill does not continue "existing" laws, but gives the President power to enact new ones and repeal old ones.

Now, then, the people—natives, aliens, and Americans—in the Philippine Islands, with this amendment as law, are to be protected, if at all, not by "existing" laws there, for this act does not "continue" them; not by the Constitution, for the President says it is not the law of the Philippine Islands, but by any and every law, so called, the President may enact, all of which are and must be valid at the will of the President, because the Constitution is not in the Philippine Islands to test, validate, or invalidate them. My God, have we come to this after a century of exclamations that ours is the home of the free and the asylum for the oppressed from all lands? [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CROWLEY].

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in rising here to-day is to register my protest against the passage of this bill, or, rather, not so much against the bill as against the passage of the amendment attached. Many members on this side would like to have discussed this bill, not from a partisan but from an unbiased patriotic standpoint, had they been given time under the stringent rules of this House. I regard this amendment, delegating despotic power to the President of the United States, as the gravest question yet presented before this Congress. I protest against its being put to a vote until every member shall have placed himself upon record, should he care to do so, extra session or no extra session. Congress has the power to legislate for these Territories, and we, today, by allowing this amendment to become a law delegate away our own authority.

It seems to me that we have been doing little else since I became a member of this body but delegate the President authority. It is a matter that seems to be creeping in upon us or creeping up

upon us. It is a very easy matter to shift responsibility, but when the time arrives, as it most certainly will, that we desire the return of what we have so lightly given up, it will have to be bought at a steep price. The minority can only protest against such outrages, and during this short session has been given but little time in which to even do that.

"The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." It is a question of power involved in this amendment. It is a question each member of this House should consider well before he votes to delegate it to any one man or any body of men. You are not performing the duty devolving upon you, under the oath you took, when you delegate your power to the President of the United States or his appointees. I can conceive no conditions under which I would vote for this bill as amended.

I do not for a moment weigh the institutions of this free Government against dollars. Listen while I read an editorial from the Washington Post of last year, the leading Republican paper of this Administration. It does not deign to shelter itself behind pretended patriotism and providential responsibility, but ruthlessly lifts the veil. It is headed:

#### LET US BE HONEST.

Why can not we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really, it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage.

All this talk about benevolent assimilation, all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purpose; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor. We all know down in our hearts that these island groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired Territories, not for any missionary or altruistic purpose, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or religious uplifting of the Filipinos. After all, the difference between a breechcloth and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. Dishonesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst—present with us as a part of our daily life and growing with our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of material for moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for missionary zeal. Why not tell the truth and say what is the fact—that we want Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon, together with any other islands in either ocean that may hereafter commend themselves to our appetite, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we hope they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge ourselves in a little candor. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At any rate, we shall have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with ourselves and the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing.

Many members who otherwise would not consider for a moment the proposition of delegating their authority as members of this body away have lain down on this amendment because the prospect of trade to be opened up with these countries has dazzled their eyes. Suppose for a moment we put our position upon the trade basis. It has been well said that trade can not be permanently profitable unless it is voluntary. We do not have to own a country in order to trade with it. The trade opened up with these people would never reach nor profit the agriculturists of this country. Already the binding-twine trust, the tobacco and sugar trusts, have a death grip on these interests in these countries.

The lives of our young soldiers are being wantonly sacrificed in establishing a condition that will tickle the pockets of a few already millionaires and endanger the interests of our own laboring class.

We took up the cause of Cuba as philanthropists. You know we went down there in the guise of missionaries intending to help the Cubans perpetuate freedom and independence in their own institutions. We made the Cubans a pledge in our declaration of war with Spain—

"That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof," and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people. Does anyone now believe that if the President is given unlimited authority by Congress that he will redeem this pledge? I hope I live in a country whose pledge is yet as sacred as its arm is strong.

We all remember how we qualified and softened our declaration of war with "unctuous piety," and we now all begin to feel that our professions are being put to shame; that there is a force at work unwilling to cut the slender thread that releases little freedom-loving Cuba. If we crush the hope of ultimate freedom in that little Republic, it will be a story of shame and dishonor to this nation. What right have we to force our ultimatum upon them?

The passage of this amendment not only affects Cuba, but it also affects 12,000,000 souls situated thousands of miles from us who



are clamoring for freedom and independence, and to whom I sincerely believe our sacred promise was given by our officers and representatives. The Filipinos had fought Spain off and on for 200 years, trying to secure their independence. Do you think they forfeited the opportunity of their independence by the circumstance of our war over Cuba? We asked them to co-operate with us. We were told by them time and again that they were fighting for independence. Their purpose was well known by our generals and at the War Department, and by the President. The President repeatedly declared that we had no title and claimed no right to anything beyond the town of Manila. The American people are bound in honor to see that Cuba and the Philippines secure their independence. But when you talk to the gentlemen on the other side of this House trying to appeal to their lofty patriotism, they talk of the wealth to be acquired, of the commercial possibilities, of the extension of trade. Their very sentences teem with greed—greed for gold.

The amendment which it is proposed to put on the Army appropriation bill is the Spooner bill with two variations. It means, if passed, that the 12,000,000 of people shall be turned over to the unlimited power of one man, and that man the President of the United States, the man who sits at the head of the freest republican form of government ever yet established. They are subject to his will under this amendment. They will be subjects and not citizens of the government he establishes over them under this amendment. It has been practically admitted that this bill is unconstitutional by the other side of the House, but still they intend to pass it. They know that the imposition of our form of government upon a people against their wish is a foul wrong, but still they intend to perpetrate it. Why was it not passed as a bill within itself? Why should it be a rider, excepting that it was the intention to force its passage through with as little outcry as possible? We have heard very little in its defense from the other side. No one man seems willing to defend it. They seem to be relying solely upon the strength of numbers. They intend to pass it. Why? Is it because of the urgent need of our fellow-citizens, the Filipinos? No, it is the urgent need of our financial exploiters, who are anxiously waiting, as Commissioner Taft discloses in his communication to the Secretary of War. The land over there is exceedingly fertile, millions of acres of public land, rich mining prospects, fortunes in the fine timber. Pass it, pass it, so we may slake our thirst.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX].

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Iowa cite as a precedent for this action the statute which was passed under Mr. Jefferson's Administration. The fact of the business is that the treaty which was ratified between the United States and France guaranteed to the people who lived in the Territory of Louisiana at that time citizenship, and not only that, but liberty and the rights of property, and the right to be taken into this Union. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And then by the act of Congress it was provided that the nine members of the council who were to be selected should be citizens of the Territory. They were all recognized as citizens. Now, what is the provision of the recent treaty between Spain and the United States? The people of the Spanish possessions which we have acquired are simply recognized as inhabitants, and the status of those inhabitants as citizens is to be fixed by the Congress of the United States.

Now, compare the two treaties—the treaty concluded during Jefferson's Administration and the recent treaty between the United States and Spain. Such a comparison will readily show that the precedent which you claim to follow finds no status in the facts of history.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY].

[Mr. RIDGELY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the rule just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] by the vote of the Republicans in this House is, in my judgment, the greatest outrage on the rights of the Democratic minority ever perpetrated in the history of this legislative body. It seems the minority have no rights here that the ruthless Republican majority are bound to respect. The Democrats are to be gagged, legitimate debate shut off, our protests frustrated, our appeals for justice denied, the rights of humanity trampled on; while the Republicans, intoxicated with power, ride roughshod over our rules, the Constitution, and the sacred guaranties of the Republic. The House of Representatives has ceased to be a deliberative body. It is the mere creature of one man. Let me read the rule prepared and just adopted by the Republicans to force through this House the pernicious and iniquitous legislation against Cuba and the Philippines:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14017) making ap-

propriations for the Army and without intervening motion to move to concur in the Senate amendments thereto in gross; after two hours' debate (one hour on each side) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said motion, and a vote then be had thereon without delay or intervening motion.

The adoption of that unjust rule is in violation of the letter and the spirit of the rules of this House. As a member of the minority of this House, I enter my most emphatic protest against it and the outrage its adoption will speedily consummate. We should have at least a week to debate this matter.

What is the purpose of this arbitrary action? What dark deed is to be enacted by virtue of its adoption? Several weeks ago this House passed the Army appropriation bill and sent it to the Senate. By some inscrutable legislative legerdemain the Republicans in the Senate placed on this Army appropriation bill two amendments or riders—one affecting Cuba and the other in regard to the Philippines. Let us see what these two amendments are. Let us examine these two un-American and outrageous riders. The first amendment or rider relates to Cuba, and reads as follows, viz:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled, "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

#### I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

#### II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

#### III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

#### IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

#### V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

#### VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

#### VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

#### VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

The second amendment, or rider, relates to the Philippines and reads as follows, viz:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: *Provided*, That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago full reports shall be made to Congress on or before the first day of each regular session of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof; and full reports of the acts and doings of said government, and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people, shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing for a more permanent government: *Provided*, That no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon or the mining rights therein shall be made: *And provided further*, That no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States, and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which can not, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.



Mr. Speaker, the far-reaching importance of these two riders, hastily put on an appropriation bill in the Senate, in violation of all precedent, is beyond calculation. They go to the very foundation of our Government. They place in the hands of the President unlimited, despotic, and autocratic power. They define and fix an arbitrary procedure and policy that may, and, in my opinion, will, cause endless trouble, enormous expense, and innumerable lives. They hazard interminable war. They present the most important question for wise, just, and deliberate solution and determination that has confronted the American Congress since the civil strife, and we are compelled to vote on them by the adoption of a partisan rule for political purposes, after a meager debate of only two hours—one hour on each side.

If the matter under consideration were not so serious, affecting as it does the lives, the liberties, the property, and the happiness of millions and millions of people under tropic suns, in the Occident and in the Orient—the attitude, the programme, and the procedure of the Republicans would be as absurd as it is Quixotic. This is a most momentous question, and we should have time to deliberate and the right to propose amendments. Under the rule we have neither. The Democratic members are cut off from their rights. They have no choice; no opportunity to give expression to their views. Perhaps we should be thankful that we can yet vote, and let the people of the country know that the Democratic representatives in Congress are to a man opposed to this infamy.

These two vicious riders, that will destroy every vestige of freedom in Cuba and every hope of liberty in the Philippines, were put on the Army bill in the Senate. They were put on in violation of all parliamentary procedure. They could not have been adopted in the first instance in this House. It has been said they were put on in the Senate by some understanding, some trade, some unholy bargain, between the alleged friends of liberty and the imperialistic opponents of freedom, in order to pass other bills and avoid an extra session of Congress. Be this as it may, I know not, although appearances are sometimes quite convincing; but we all know these riders, to trample in the dust in Cuba and the Philippines justice, liberty, and humanity, would never be here if the Democratic Senators had wanted to defeat them. They never could have been adopted in the Senate without the acquiescence of the Democrats there. They are responsible for this situation.

These riders are most despotic, most iniquitous, most unjust, and most inhuman. They portray in burning letters the sordid, greedy, and corrupt spirit of commercialism, which destroys our highest ideals, makes us ashamed of our past, and compels us to bow our heads in humiliation as we witness the present and contemplate the future of our country. They make our great Republic despicable and a byword of reproach. They reveal and unmask the cruel, sordid, treacherous policy of the Administration, and expose to full view the hypocrisy, the perfidy, and the infamy of the Republican party. I am opposed to these riders. They will never pass with my consent or my vote. If Congress enacts them into law, the President will be the most powerful, the most despotic, and the most autocratic potentate on earth. I am opposed to delegating the powers of Congress to the President. If these gradual surrenders of vested constitutional rights and transfers of legislative powers to the Executive continue, the day, in my judgment, is not far distant when we shall cease to be a representative government responsible to the people.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has said that the provision regarding the Philippines is similar to the resolution enacted by Congress in regard to the temporary government of the Louisiana purchase. I beg to differ with the gentleman. He is sadly in error. To conclusively show the wide and startling difference let me read the act of 1803 regarding the temporary government of Jefferson's Louisiana purchase:

Until the expiration of the present session of Congress, or unless provision be sooner made for the temporary government of the said territories, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the full enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Compare the two. There is no analogy between them. A casual reading of the two acts is sufficient. One is "until the expiration of the present session of Congress." The other is indefinite, and for all desired and practical purposes surrenders absolute and complete power to the President. The Philippine provision in this bill and the act of 1803, relating to the temporary government of Louisiana, are as far apart as the poles. And I say now that if the Republicans are sincere in their present contention they will permit the Democrats to offer as an amendment for the provision under discussion affecting the Philippines a substitute similar to the enactment of 1803 relating to Louisiana. If the other side will permit us to do that, I know and I declare that every Democrat on this side of the House will cheerfully vote for it. I challenge the majority to allow us to do it. Your refusal is an evidence of the insincerity and hypocrisy of your pretensions,

and another demonstration of the imperialistic policy of force of the Republican party.

Let me, sir, say again what I have frequently said before on the floor of this House, that I am now, always have been, and always will be, opposed to the cruel, the inhuman, the ruthless, the un-American, and the unchristian conduct of this Administration to the struggling Filipinos, whose only crime is the love of liberty, their hope for freedom, and their aspiration for independence. If we had been true to ourselves, and to the great ideals of American manhood, patriotism, and statesmanship, not a drop of American blood would have been shed in the Philippine Archipelago. Sordid greed has cost us hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, and cruel lust for power thousands and thousands of precious lives. And the end is not yet.

How long will this costly war of extermination and subjugation last? Can anyone tell? Will it be the black page of Spain's history over again? I pray not. Sooner than see the Republic destroyed, and the Philippine Islands the tomb of the flower and the youth of America, I would do what I believe Abraham Lincoln would do if he were at the head of the Government to-day—help the Filipinos establish a stable government of their own, a republic fashioned after this Republic, and then say to all the world, "Hands off; any interference with the Filipino republic will be an act unfriendly to the United States."

So much, sir, in regard to the adoption of this partisan, unjust, and arbitrary rule in order to choke off debate, and to my position on the amendment surrendering all legislative power to the President, to perform whatever his autocratic will and despotic purpose may suggest regarding the Philippine Islands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something in regard to the other amendment, or rider—the one relating to Cuba. I have been a friend of the Cuban patriots for years. When I first came to Congress, six years ago, I championed their cause in Congress and out of Congress, in season and out of season. I did all I could to help them throw off the tyrannous yoke of cruel and oppressive Spain. They were then waging a just war to secure their freedom and their independence. My sympathy was all with the Cuban patriots. I knew their oppression; I was familiar with all their suffering, with their long and heroic struggle for liberty and the right to govern themselves.

I introduced in this House the first resolution of sympathy for them, indulging the hope that they would succeed because their cause was just. I introduced in this House the first resolution granting them belligerent rights; the first resolution recognizing their independence, and the first resolution declaring war against Spain. When war was finally declared, I organized in the city of New York a regiment of soldiers and begged the Republican governor of New York, and also the President, to accept it and muster it into the service. They refused—presumably for political reasons. I was willing and anxious to resign my seat in this House to go to the front with my regiment and fight for Cuban independence, but could not get a chance, ostensibly because I was a Democrat. A perusal of the proceedings of this House before, during, and after the Spanish-American war will leave no one in doubt regarding my position on the Cuban question. I wanted to see Cuba free. In the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress I said:

My position is well known and unchangeable. Long, long ago I made up my mind. I have never deviated from the first stand I took. I want to see Cuba free. She must be free and independent. The Spaniard and his yellow flag—the emblem of atrocity—must go.

You know that in all the history of the world no people ever deserved the right of self-government more than the heroic, struggling Cuban patriots. For centuries they have been oppressed, robbed, starved, and murdered by a cruel foreign power. The tyranny of Spain, her refined butcheries, her fiendish brutalities, are the blackest pages in the annals of the world. \* \* \*

What a sad story the history of poor Cuba tells! For more than three centuries Spain has ruled her with a blood-stained and an iron hand. It has been a thousand times worse than the rule of the Turk. It has been a thousand times worse than the rule of a barbaric military despotism over a conquered and subjected province.

The history of poor Cuba's trials, her woes, her troubles, and her tribulations never has been written and never will be written. Not half the truth will ever be known. And more the shame!

Spanish rule in Cuba has been one long, unending, hideous carnival of crime, of public plunder, of rapine, of official robbery, of murder, of starvation, of destitution, of assassination, and of cruel, torturing death—a frightful, big black blot on the pages of civilization; a lasting, burning disgrace to all Christendom; an impudent, imperial challenge, backed by the bayonet, to the sober sense of humanity and the Christian civilization of the world.

And subsequently I said in the same Congress:

I stand now where I have always stood, where I will stand until the last—for the liberty-loving people of Cuba, who are making and have made as heroic and as gallant a battle for freedom and independence as any people ever made in the history of the world. I want to see them win, and I know they will win if this great Republic, which should stand as a shining light, as a beacon, and as an example for all the other republics of the world and for every people struggling for liberty and independence, will simply do its duty.

That, sir, in substance, was my position then in regard to Cuba. I was for Cuban independence then, and I am for Cuban independence now. I have not changed my views. Nothing has occurred since the signing of the treaty of peace in Paris to make



me alter in any way my original opinions. On the contrary, much has happened to confirm and strengthen them. The record is made up. It speaks for itself. We should keep faith. We went to war with Spain to free Cuba, not to annex Cuba; not to free the Cubans from Spanish slavery in order to enforce American despotism. We declared our high moral purpose of intervention to be in the interest of civilization.

We patriotically proclaimed that the war was to be waged for liberty, for freedom, and for humanity, and called all the world to witness our noble intentions and our undying devotion to the fundamental tenets of the fathers as embodied in the immortal Declaration of Independence. As proof of this let me read and again put in the RECORD the resolution of Congress declaring war against Spain, approved by the President on the 20th day of April, 1898:

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship with 206 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited; Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

THOMAS B. REED.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

GARRET A. HOBART.

Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate.

Approved April 20, 1898.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

There is nothing doubtful, nothing ambiguous, about that resolution. It pledged the sacred honor of the Government and the solemn word of our people to drive Spain from Cuba; declared that the Cubans are, and of right ought to be, free and independent; and disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island. The question now is, it seems to me, Shall we keep our word or break it? Shall we live up to our sacred promise or abjectly stultify ourselves in order that personal pelf may follow political perfidy?

Let us be honest. We must not forget. We should keep our word. We should fulfill the letter and the spirit of the promise. We should do our duty and give the Cubans absolute freedom and independence. There should be no conditions. Any different policy now, any deviation from our promise of three years ago, will be national dishonor and a stultification that must bring to the cheek of every honest American the blush of shame. Shall the plighted faith of the nation be kept? Americans, read that sinister Republican rider regarding Cuba, attached to this appropriation bill by the servile servants of commercialism in the Senate, in the light of our patriotic declaration of war, and answer! Its adoption here to-day means national dishonor, national repudiation, national shame, and national perfidy.

The vote here to-day, sir, will show that the Republican party has chosen to stand for disgrace and dishonor—for pelf and power; that the representatives of the Democratic party stand for liberty, for loyalty to the principles of the fathers, for freedom, for the fulfillment of the national promise, for the sacred rights of man, for peace and prosperity, for the Constitution, and, above and beyond all, for the traditions and the true glory and destiny of the Republic.

For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,  
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong.  
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame  
Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame;  
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim.

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,  
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;  
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloomer blight,  
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right,  
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill in reference to Cuba and the Philippines are wise and salutary both for the people of the United States and for the people of those islands.

First, as to Cuba, the Senate amendment is timely and prudent. While we stand pledged to recognize the independence of Cuba, we do not stand pledged to allow it to become again the seat of disorder, the propagator of the plague, the prey of foreign powers, and the base of attack upon our own country; and in giving Cuba her independence we must couple with the gift such conditions that, while not harming her, will make us safe. We propose that Cuba's independence shall be a shield to protect her and not a sword to hurt us.

Speaking for myself, I feel free to say that when I voted three years ago that the people of Cuba were "free and independent" I did not so vote because I believed it, but because it was embedded in a resolution requiring Spain to leave the island and directing the President of the United States to drive her out if she refused to go; and I, along with many other members of this House, swallowed the bitter with the sweet, voting for what we did not believe, to get what we wanted—that is, to force Spain to leave Cuba.

CUBA MUST BE OUR WARD.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Cubans are fit for self-government, and so I do not want us to turn the island completely over to them until they demonstrate their capacity to rule their island wisely and well, so that life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness shall be secured to all under good laws properly administered.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Cuba are wise and prudent, they would be glad to have our Government exercise a sort of mild guardianship for a short time; and the fact that so many of their leaders seem devoid of all gratitude to the United States for the many millions of dollars we have spent in their behalf makes me suspicious of what Cuba's fate may be when wholly committed to their hands.

I want Cuba fairly treated; but I want my own country fairly treated also. What have we done for Cuba? We found her people dying of starvation in prison pens, or slaughtered by a merciless foreign soldiery; and we have driven out these soldiers, opened the prison doors and made every Cuban free, and fed them generously from our own table. We found the Cubans deprived of all voice in their own government, and we have turned their oppressors out of power and given all of the municipal offices to the Cubans themselves.

We found Cuba desolated by fire and sword from one end of the island to the other, and we have brought peace and law and order, and opened to every man full opportunity to honorably and easily earn his own living. In a word, Mr. Speaker, we found Cuba a hell, and we are fast converting it into a paradise.

And shall we have no right to guard this island and see to it that disorder shall not take the place of order, and see to it that the island, by unwise treaties, be not given over to our enemies, and to see to it that the yellow fever does not use its shores as a base from which to invade our country and destroy our people?

This is all that the Senate amendment proposes to do, and if we should let Cuba go out of our hands without guaranties for our own protection, we should be derelict in duty, false to our own people, and deficient in that foresight which belongs to prudent statesmanship.

OUR TREATMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Next, as to the Philippines. The Senate amendment proposes to give the President general authority to govern the Philippine Islands. I do not propose to discuss this amendment in detail. It is sufficient for me to call attention to the fact that it is, in substance, the same as the authority given by Congress to President Jefferson to govern Louisiana, and to President Monroe to govern Florida; and if it was no crime in those Congresses to grant such power, surely it can be no crime in this Congress. Jefferson was the founder of the Democratic party, and James Monroe was one of its great apostles, and yet it was deemed all right in their day to grant them full power to govern Louisiana and Florida, then newly acquired foreign territory.

In order that the Senate amendment may be compared to the law under which Jefferson ruled Louisiana and Monroe ruled Florida, I give all three. The pith of the Senate amendment is as follows:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: *Provided*, That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

The Jefferson law, passed in 1803, is as follows:

That until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for temporary government of the said territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing (French) government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.



The law under which Monroe ruled Florida, passed in 1821, reads as follows:

All military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by officers of the existing (Spanish) government of the same territories (East and West Florida) shall be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any impartial man will quickly decide that the Senate amendment is the most liberal of the three; besides the Senate amendment, in addition to the restriction as to franchises which I have quoted, contains a prohibition against the sale or lease of public lands, timber, or mines, none of which were in the Jefferson or Madison laws.

#### THE PRESIDENT UNJUSTLY CRITICISED.

For the last two years we have heard a great deal of complaint from certain "good people" that the President had no right to govern the Philippines without the authority of Congress. The abuse by these "good people" was not against Congress for not legislating about the Philippines, but against the President for presuming to govern the Philippines without the authority of Congress, as though the inaction of Congress was not equivalent to its consent to the President's course.

It has always seemed to me that these "good people" should have launched their fulminations against Congress for not legislating; but it was the programme of these "good people" to do all they could to break down the President; and so they had sworn in their hearts to abuse McKinley not only for what he had done and had not done, but also to abuse him for all that Congress has done or has not done.

And what is the secret of all this vituperation? McKinley stands as the great champion of American protection, as the chief defender of the gold standard, and as the chief promoter of American prosperity; and the defeated Free Silverites, the baffled free traders, and the disgraced false prophets of calamity and hard times have determined that they will do all they can to destroy our President, and if they can not wholly destroy him, at least mortify and humiliate him—

Which, if not victory, is yet revenge.

Scratch any of these abusers of McKinley, and you will find him either a Free Silverite or a free trader, or a natural-born calamity howler.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I get tired of listening on the floor of this House and reading in the newspapers this everlasting twaddle about McKinley's "imperialism," coming, as it does, from the lips of the very men who worship Jefferson as a god and Monroe as a saint. Oh, it was all right for Jefferson and Monroe to do what McKinley is now doing, but it is all wrong in McKinley.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore said, and now say, that if Bryan had been elected four years ago the Spanish war would have come on all the same, Dewey would have sunk the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay all the same, our Army would now be in the Philippine Islands as it is to-day, and Bryan would be doing there just what McKinley is now doing, and all of these men now abusing McKinley would be praising and glorifying Bryan, and calling him a second Jefferson and a new Monroe; and if any man dared to call Bryan an imperialist he would be in danger of being hung by a mob or burned at the stake.

These fellows who are abusing McKinley are like the fellows who abused Jesus; and when they had the right to choose between Jesus and Barabbas, they all chose Barabbas the robber, and cried out, "Away with Jesus! Crucify him!" And so these Free Silverites, free traders, and calamity howlers cry out, "Away with McKinley! Crucify him! Give us Bryan!"

There is one strange thing about these Democratic politicians—whatever their leaders do is all right, but whatever the Republicans do is all wrong, even when they do the very same thing the Democrats have done. Now, here we are doing our very best to follow in the footsteps of Jefferson and Monroe, those mighty Democrats, as marked out by Democratic Congresses, and yet these latter-day saints of Democracy come along and declare that we are traveling the wrong road.

#### FORMER PRESIDENTS ABUSED.

In these days of telegraphs, railroads, steamships, and daily newspapers time rapidly becomes ancient, and what took place one hundred years ago is almost as unknown as what took place in Rome two thousand years ago or what took place in Jerusalem three thousand years ago.

How many of the people of my own State recall the fact that when North Carolina ceded the territory now Tennessee to the General Government, George Washington, then President of the United States, appointed William Blount governor, and gave him and two Federal judges legislative, judicial, and executive powers over the new Territory? Indeed, Governor Blount did not always wait for his colleagues, but often, and indeed generally, acted alone. The very first legislative act of the new governor of the new Territory was to create the counties of Knox and Jefferson, now in my district. The act begins thus:

By William Blount, governor in and over the territory of the United States of America south of the River Ohio:

*Be it ordained, That two new counties be laid out and established, \* \* \* from and after the 15th of June instant [1792], by the name of Jefferson County and Knox County.*

This ordinance fixes the boundaries of these two new counties, establishes local courts, and fixes the times and places for their meeting, and concludes thus:

Done at Knoxville the 11th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1792.

WILLIAM BLOUNT.

By the governor:  
DANIEL SMITH, *Secretary*.

That is the way, Mr. Speaker, that President George Washington and his governor, William Blount, did things one hundred and eight years ago, and yet we find that our liberties survived the awful strain. Mr. Speaker, there were "good men" in that day who called Washington a "king," and charged that he aimed to "usurp the constitutional powers of government," and there were cartoons printed and scattered abroad picturing Washington dressed in kingly robes, with a crown on his head and a scepter in his hand.

Yes, awful things were predicted then of Washington; but the country survived, our liberties remain unimpaired, the Constitution continues in full force, and the blessed liberty of free speech, to abuse and vilify our Presidents and all others in authority, still exists undiminished.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of our great Presidents have been charged with violating the Constitution and acting the tyrant. The charge was even made against Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the discoverer of the rights of the governed and the inventor of the Democratic party.

And similar charges were made against Jackson, Polk, Lincoln, and Grant—all made by "good people"—and yet our country lives, Washington is honored, Jefferson is honored, Jackson, Polk, Lincoln, and Grant are all honored, the names of these "good people" who made the charges are all forgotten, our liberties remain, our country has grown and prospered, our people are happy and contented, and the God of high heaven seems still to smile upon us and bless us.

And so will it be, Mr. Speaker, in the case of President McKinley. These "good people" who charge him with "imperialism," who declare that he has "violated the Constitution," and who denounce him as a "tyrant" and a "usurper," will all die and be forgotten, as have those who vilified Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Polk and Lincoln and Grant. Our liberties will continue; our rights will be preserved; our Constitution will be maintained; our country will remain the "land of the free and the home of the brave;" the people of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines will have been transfigured by the spirit of American liberty and the genius of American civilization; and the baby is now born that will live to see the day when the name of William McKinley will be linked with those of Washington and Lincoln as the three greatest Presidents produced by the great American Republic from its foundation to the close of the nineteenth century, Washington being the great founder of the Republic, Lincoln its great preserver, and McKinley its great expander.

#### OUR POLICY IN PORTO RICO PROVED WISE.

You remember, Mr. Speaker, the awful hullabaloo raised a year ago against the law we passed imposing a tariff tax on certain goods imported to and exported from Porto Rico, the taxes thus raised to be spent there in lieu of all other taxes. We were charged with having violated the Constitution, with having robbed the Porto Ricans of their lawful right of self-taxation, and with having actually turned down the President himself. These Democrats are a queer set of fellows. They do not want the President turned down unless they do it themselves! McKinley was all wrong in reference to Porto Rican taxation until the Republicans in Congress differed with him on this question, and then, presto, change! McKinley all at once became just exactly right. But McKinley despised their approbation as he despised their opposition. McKinley had the good sense to see that the plan of Congress was better just then than his own, and he magnanimously and patriotically approved our plan.

And what has happened, Mr. Speaker? Our law was found to be a great blessing, the people of Porto Rico approved of it and have prospered under it and want it continued. But the legislature of Porto Rico, elected by the people of the island, have passed a tax law to take the place of our tariff tax law, and now we hear a howl from the people of Porto Rico against any change in the law we passed.

And what are the Democrats now saying? What are these howlers now saying, who had so much to say a year ago about Porto Rico being oppressed? Not a word! They are as silent as dumb men. Their voices have left them. They howl no more. They have been confounded by the great fact now overwhelmingly demonstrated that the law we Republicans passed for the taxation of Porto Rican exports and imports was a most wise and salutary law and has been a great blessing to that beautiful island.

The Porto Rican legislature has passed a law to supersede the law we passed, for our law was only temporary and was to continue only until the Porto Ricans could pass a tax law of their



own. This Porto Rican tax law is called the "Hollander bill," and a few days ago a committee of Porto Ricans came to Washington to beg that our law should continue.

#### PORTO RICANS PREFER CONGRESSIONAL LAW TO THEIR OWN.

I read this account of their mission from the Washington Post of February 25, and call attention to the fact that the Post was hostile to the law we passed. I read:

Messrs. W. Borda and Vicente Balbas, of Porto Rico, members of the commission appointed to protest to President McKinley and Congress against the Hollander revenue bill, and Mr. Freeman Halstead, secretary of the commission, arrived in Washington last night, and are guests at the Arlington. The commission was appointed at a mass meeting held in San Juan February 2 and attended by more than 3,000 Porto Ricans, representing the varied business interests of the island. The commissioners expect to call upon the President to-day or to-morrow, and within a few days will present to the Government a formal protest against the operations of the Hollander bill.

The members of the commission are among the wealthiest and most prominent of Porto Ricans. Mr. Borda is an American citizen, with a legal residence in New York, but has large property interests in the island. Mr. Balbas is also a large property owner, and is editor and proprietor of the *Heraldo*, the leading paper of the island. Mr. Halstead is an American newspaper man who is at present managing editor of the *San Juan News*.

"There is no longer any opposition on the island," said Mr. Halstead last night, "to the 15 per cent tariff imposed by Congress upon Porto Rican imports and exports to the United States. The revolution of sentiment with reference to the tariff has been gradual, but it has been complete, and complaints against it are no longer heard. The object of the commission's coming to Washington is to induce the Government to allow the present tariff to remain, instead of having it supplanted by the objectionable Hollander bill. Already, as a result of the operations of the Hollander bill, a large number of tobacco manufactories and distilleries have shut down, throwing more than a thousand men out of employment."

And in like manner, Mr. Speaker, will all of our other laws be found just, wise, and salutary; and before McKinley's next term is out many of the men now howling against him will have another spell of the lockjaw, for they will see, as the world will see, that all of our laws relating to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands are wise, just, and salutary, promotive of the welfare of those islands, and grand exhibitions of the wisdom, generosity, and magnanimous purposes of the Government of the United States in dealing with them.

#### EXPANSION OF NATIONS.

It is no uncommon thing to hear a certain class of orators say: "Rome acquired foreign territory and Rome fell." Hence they argue if the United States acquires foreign territory it will fall also. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, if Rome had never acquired foreign territory she never would have been Rome. She would have been nothing but a contemptible conglomeration of insignificant huts on the banks of the Tiber, the prey of the first petty conqueror who had an appetite for such worthless spoil.

It was by the "acquisition of foreign territory" that Rome spread her civilization over the world, and thereby did more for mankind than any other nation of antiquity. It was through imperial Rome that the civil law was impressed on every nation of continental Europe, and through these nations on the whole world. It was through imperial Rome that the Christian religion was enabled to triumph over paganism and become the dominant religion of Europe, and through Europe the dominant religion of the earth.

To say that Rome's downfall grew out of her expansion is to say that a man's downfall is the result of his growth from childhood. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen who oppose expansion oppose growth. They say growth is a sign of decay and destruction. They remind me of dotting mothers who grieve that their baby boys should ever grow up to be "awful men," or their daughters ever marry, not stopping to consider that if such wishes prevailed the whole human race would have come to an end with Adam and Eve!

No doubt some of these "good people" think the children of Israel made a great mistake by crossing the Red Sea, traversing the desert, and fording the Jordan to make war on the Canaanites and conquer their country.

These same "good people," if they are consistent, are bound to grieve because our forefathers crossed the ocean and drove the Indians out of this land.

Look at England! Suppose she had acquired no foreign territory, what would she be to-day? A little fraction of a little island; long ago, in all probability, conquered by France or Spain. But by the acquisition of foreign territory she has spread over nearly one-third of the earth the best civilization, the wisest laws, the truest forms of liberty, and the most exalted religion the world has ever known.

Our own country is the fruit of England's expansion, and if she had never expanded the United States of America would have never existed.

And, Mr. Speaker, if we had never expanded, where would we be to-day as a people? We would still be clinging to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. The first step our forefathers took after leaving their ships was to "acquire foreign territory;" and every westward step they have taken since has been to "acquire foreign territory." And on and on we have gone, crossing the Blue Ridge Mountains, the Alleghenies, the Smokies, and the Cumberland; then crossing the Mississippi River, then the prairies and the

plains, then the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevadas, until at last we reached the Pacific Ocean.

And here we were disposed to rest until the thunder of Dewey's cannon, like the voice of God's angel, called on us to cross the Pacific Ocean and plant our feet on its other shore.

No doubt a plenty of "good people" said it was unwise, inhuman, and unchristian for our forefathers to cross the Atlantic Ocean three hundred years ago and drive out the American Indians and take possession of their country; and if these "good people" had had their way there never would have been any white men over here and never would have been any United States of America, but all of its splendid territory would be to-day as it was when Columbus discovered it—an unbroken wilderness inhabited by unbroken savages—and these howlers and kickers and fault-finders would never have been born.

#### INCONSISTENCY OF SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS.

There is one thing about some of these "good men" who are charging the Republicans with oppressing the people of the Philippines that strikes me as a little inconsistent. The "good men" to whom I now refer live in those Southern States where the negro vote is practically abolished. I want to know why it is they are such zealous defenders of the rights of yellow and black people who live ten thousand miles away and yet are so hostile to the right of yellow and black people who live in their own States, and are their own neighbors? In the New Testament the question is asked how we can love him whom we have not seen, when we fail to love him whom we have seen.

If I saw these Southern Democrats standing up for the rights of the negro in their own States, then I could believe them when they say they want the black and yellow people of the Philippines to have all the political and civil rights of American freemen. It must be a poor political rule that works one way at home and works another way abroad. That must be a strange sauce that is good for the goose but bad for the gander.

That is an unrighteous kind of charity that has closed ears and closed hands for those who are born and raised our neighbors, but has open ears and open hands for those who live 10,000 miles away. I used to hear it said that "charity begins at home," but now these Democrats want me to believe that charity begins 10,000 miles away from home. That may be Democratic charity, but it is not the sort of charity that St. Paul tells us of; and the great apostle says that though these men speak with the tongues of angels, if they have not this true charity, they "become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Verily, St. Paul must have foreseen the day when Southern Democrats would rise on the floor of this House and plead for the people of the Philippines, while oppressing their own neighbors. I wonder if some of these Southern Democrats, who so eloquently declare that the people of the Philippines should be given every right and every liberty and every privilege we enjoy, do not hear jingling in their ears, while they plead for those 10,000 miles away and oppress those at home, "You are become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." And verily, Mr. Speaker, we have had a blizzard of "sounding brass" this day on this floor.

#### FALSE PROPHETS OF EVIL.

"Good men" are sometimes prophets of evil. During our Revolutionary war good men predicted that it would result in the destruction of what few liberties our ancestors then enjoyed. During the formation of our Constitution "good men" predicted that instead of being the shield of liberty it would prove to be the sword of tyranny. When Washington was President some "good men" declared he was no better than a king. And when Jefferson became President some "good men" branded him as an emperor. Some "good men" denounced Andrew Jackson as a tyrant and a usurper. Some "good men" charged that Abraham Lincoln was a despot. Some "good men" predicted that if Grant were elected President he would overturn the Constitution and we would never elect another President.

And now, Mr. Speaker, some of these same "good men" are calling William McKinley an "emperor," and are prophesying that he will destroy our Constitution and rob us of our liberties.

Scientific men say that sometimes the eye is so diseased that everything we see has a sickly, yellow color. So, it would seem, there is a disease of the mind that causes everything to appear dark and foreboding. Persons that have this disease, if they belong to the church, see nothing but hell and damnation in front of the human race; and if they are politicians, see nothing but war, pestilence, famine, and general ruin in the future of their country.

Mr. Speaker, in my day most of these "good men" have been Democrats. Away back in 1860 I heard them declaring, with tears in their eyes and grief in their voices, that the success of the Republican party would ruin our country. During the civil war I heard these "good men" lamenting that our liberties were gone and our rights everlastingly lost. Since the close of the war I have heard these "good men" swear that the "bloated bondholders" were devouring the substance of the people and that



starvation would be the sure fate of the poor. A little later on these "good people" made oath that the "robber barons" would soon own everything, and everybody else own nothing. Indeed, only four years ago thousands of these "good men" traveled all over the United States warning the people that the "Gold Bugs" had all conspired to buy up our country and sell it to England.

And now, Mr. Speaker, these same "good men," with voices of lamentation, are predicting that William McKinley and the Republican party, having already devoured the Porto Ricans, bodies, boots, and breeches, are on their way to swallow Cuba and devastate the Philippines.

FALSE PROPHETS PERISH, BUT THE NATION SURVIVES.

When I was a boy there was a religious sect known as the "Millerites," who believed that the world was doomed to come to an end on a certain day, and on that day they assembled themselves together and proclaimed themselves the elect and damned all the balance of mankind.

During the debate here this afternoon, when I saw and heard Democrat after Democrat get up and declare that they were all the good men left on earth to defend the Constitution and preserve liberty, and that William McKinley and the Republicans were defiling the holy places and outraging human rights and massacring the children of freedom, I was reminded of the "Millerites" and took courage; for, though the "Millerites" scared many old women and young girls, nevertheless the good earth was not destroyed; seedtime and harvest continued, and the "Millerites" became a laughingstock the balance of their lives.

And so, Mr. Speaker, these "good men" of the Democratic party will die as did those other "good men," their predecessors; their prophecies of evil will come to naught, as did the prophecies of the "Millerites" and of those other "good men;" and William McKinley and the Republican party, like Washington and the Federal party, like Lincoln and the Union party, will go on fighting the battles of progress, extending the area of freedom, and carrying the blessings of liberty, law, religion, and science wherever the flag of our country may float and the footsteps of our countrymen are planted.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the question here involved is not a partisan question. There is no controversy as to whether the Constitution follows the flag, or whether the Constitution extends itself. The question is simply whether it is right to authorize the President to suggest the conditions contained in the Senate amendments to this bill relating to Cuba.

By joint resolution of Congress adopted April 20, 1898, we declared that—

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

The declaration in this resolution "that the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent" was not all true.

At the time this resolution was adopted they were not free and independent, but were a colony of Spain in revolt against tyranny of long standing, and the statement that they were then free and independent was not true, but did no harm and is not necessary in determining the relations which now ought to subsist between Cuba and the United States as a result of the war with Spain which followed this resolution.

The essential parts of the declaration contained in the resolution of April 20, 1898, are:

1. That the people of Cuba ought to be free and independent.
2. That the Government of the United States demands that Spain relinquish its authority and government in Cuba and that it quit and vacate Cuba and Cuban waters with its land and naval forces.
3. That the President of the United States is empowered to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute these resolutions.
4. "That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or

intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

By these resolutions the Government of the United States voluntarily placed limitations upon its future action respecting the island of Cuba and is estopped, in equity and good conscience, from taking action inconsistent with them.

That is to say, (1) we have declared that the people of Cuba ought to be free and independent.

2. We have disclaimed any intention to claim "sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the island except for the pacification thereof."

3. And we have asserted our determination when pacification is accomplished "to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

In view of the suggestion now contained in section 6 (relating to the Isle of Pines) of this authorization to the President as to relinquishment of the government and control of the island, the language of the resolution of April 20, 1898, whereby our declaration of intentions is limited to the "island of Cuba" is significant.

We went to war with Spain for the cause of humanity.

So far as I can remember no other war was ever fought prompted by such high and honorable motives.

The war was demanded by our people, with but few exceptions, without regard to politics.

The war which had been raging in Cuba for more than three years was practically a continuation of the revolutions of 1844, 1848, and 1851, and the ten years' war from 1868 to 1878.

Age and sex had not been spared. Every resource of Cuba had been drained to pay for Spanish domination. Justice had become a farce. Highwaymen had plundered where the general government overlooked, and finally, under the administration of General Weyler, the policy of concentration was adopted, whereby thousands of people had been starved to death.

We had for some time been put to great trouble and expense to restrain our own patriotic people from the breach of international law in their sympathy for Cuba.

In the hope of bloodless adjustment the President had urged reasonable concessions by Spain without avail.

Aside from our duty to abate international disorder at our own door, we were under a moral obligation to interfere.

By the Monroe doctrine we had warned other nations against aiding Cuba, and had thereby cut Cuba off from seeking aid elsewhere.

We had reasserted the Monroe doctrine in our party platforms and had reaffirmed the right of this Government "to give that doctrine effect by responding to the appeals of any American state for friendly intervention in case of European encroachment."

We had been specific as to Cuba, and said:

"The Government of Spain having lost control of Cuba and being unable to protect the lives and property of resident American citizens or to comply with its treaty obligations, we believe that the Government of the United States should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island."

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The Monroe doctrine is international law, and nations must be presumed to take notice of international law.

All that has been done by the United States with reference to Cuba has been done subject to the Monroe doctrine, and the question now arises whether what is proposed to be asked by these amendments is within the scope of our rights under the Monroe doctrine.

A brief review of the incidents leading to the declaration of the Monroe doctrine and of the American policy which that doctrine supplemented becomes necessary as a part of this argument.

In 1793, when France declared war with Great Britain and our Government was called upon for the first time to determine what our relations ought to be to the nations of Europe, Washington issued his proclamation of neutrality, for which he was slandered as no President since his time has been slandered.

On his final retirement, in his farewell address, he set forth his reasons for not interfering in the affairs of Europe, and his policy outlined in that address has been the settled policy of this nation ever since.

In Jefferson's inaugural address, March 4, 1801, he declared that the principles which should govern his Administration were "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none."

He repeated this in his annual message to Congress October 17, 1803.

The policy of Washington of no entangling alliances with foreign nations was afterwards supplemented by the Monroe doctrine.

After the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, in 1815, Alexander of Russia, believing that Napoleon's overthrow was a signal illustration of providential interposition in favor of the divine right



of kings, invited the Kings of Prussia and Austria to join him in a league, which he called the "Holy Alliance." The expressed purpose of this alliance was that the kings who were parties to it would endeavor to rule their dominions in accordance with the principles of Christianity. The monarchs who joined the alliance soon fell away from its high purpose, if they ever really entertained it. The Kings of France, Spain, Naples, and Sardinia joined the league.

Within two months there grew out of the holy alliance what is known as the quadruple treaty between Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Great Britain, signed at Paris in 1815.

At the signing of this treaty it was agreed that the parties thereto should meet in conference at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, and at the Aix-la-Chapelle conference the powers united in a project for the joint regulation of European affairs.

Later and pending another meeting of the powers at Vienna in 1822, Spain being then involved in trouble with her American colonies, Mr. Canning, then minister of England, proposed to Mr. Rush, then representing the United States at London, a joint declaration by England and the United States that "it was impossible to look with indifference upon European intervention in the affairs of the colonies of Spain and to see them acquired by a third power."

Mr. Rush refused to join in this joint declaration, on the theory that such joinder would be inconsistent with the policy of Washington as set forth in his Farewell Address, and thereupon made report to Mr. Monroe.

Mr. Monroe submitted the letters of Mr. Rush to Mr. Jefferson, who replied, saying, among other things, that "this question \* \* \* is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us."

In his annual message to Congress December 2, 1823, Mr. Monroe promulgated the Monroe doctrine, the substance of which is contained in three inhibitions:

1. No more European colonies on these continents.
2. No extension of European political systems to any portion of this hemisphere.
3. No European interposition in the affairs of the Spanish-American republics.

The Monroe doctrine has been applied to Cuba in the following instances:

October 25, 1825, Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, in a communication to Mr. Brown, then American minister to France, referring to a former communication, said:

"It was stated to the French Government that the United States could not see with indifference these islands (Cuba and Porto Rico) passing from Spain to any other European power."

Mr. Calhoun, in a speech in the Senate May 15, 1848, declared it to be the fixed determination of this Government "that if Cuba pass from her (Spain) it shall not be into any other hands but ours."

December 1, 1852, Mr. Everett, then Secretary of State under President Fillmore, declared that the President fully concurred with his predecessors "that the United States could not see with indifference the island of Cuba fall into the possession of any other European government than Spain."

By these amendments we now propose:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

1. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.
2. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.
3. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.
4. That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.
5. That the government of Cuba will execute and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

6. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

7. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

8. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

This amendment is simply an authorization to the President "to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" under certain enumerated conditions.

The question for us to determine is, first, whether these conditions in any way violate our resolution of April 20, 1898, construed in the light of the Monroe doctrine, subject to which that resolution was passed; second, whether they are consonant with the Monroe doctrine.

The Supreme Court of the United States in *Neeley vs. Henkel* (decided in January, 1901) sums up the situation to that date in these words:

The legislative and executive branches of the Government, by the joint resolution of April 20, 1898, expressly disclaimed any purpose to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, "except for the pacification thereof," and asserted the determination of the United States, that object being accomplished, to leave the government and control of Cuba to its own people. All that has been done in relation to Cuba has had that end in view, and, so far as the court is informed by the public history of the relations of this country with that island, nothing has been done inconsistent with the declared object of the war with Spain.

The court then declares the relations of Cuba and the United States and the obligations of the United States to the inhabitants of Cuba growing out of the joint resolution of April 20, 1898, as follows:

As between Spain and the United States—indeed, as between the United States and all foreign nations—Cuba, upon the cessation of hostilities with Spain and after the treaty of Paris, was to be treated as if it were conquered territory. But as between the United States and Cuba, that island is territory held in trust for the inhabitants of Cuba, to whom it rightfully belongs and to whose exclusive control it will be surrendered when a stable government shall have been established by their voluntary action.

The question which must be honestly considered is whether we are complying with our obligations and our duty to the people of Cuba by the terms of this our authorization to the President.

It is proposed—

#### I.

that the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

This section comes clearly within the Monroe doctrine in that it provides:

- (1) Against the extension of any European political system to Cuba by binding her not to enter "into any treaty or compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair" her independence.
- (2) It provides against permission to any foreign power or powers for "lodgment in or control over any portion" of Cuba by colonization or otherwise.

#### II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government shall be inadequate.

This simply provides that the island shall not mortgage itself beyond its power of redemption, and so that it may not hereafter pass in whole or in part under the control of any foreign power by the insidious operation of a public debt.

This is a legitimate exercise of the Monroe doctrine as emphasized by our specific declarations regarding Cuba.

It is also a measure of proper protection of Cuba, the propriety of which is emphasized by conditions in Mexico where the import duties of Vera Cruz and Pacific ports are held by Great Britain for interest on a fifty-million dollar loan negotiated in 1826.

The case of Egypt, which is now controlled by Great Britain through the Egyptian debt, is notorious.

Failure of payment of indebtedness for betterments and improvements at maturity to a nation rich enough to make the loan would be followed by seizure of ports and customs.

It is our duty to guard against such seizure and control for the future peace of mankind. Further, it is our duty to guard against such contingencies under our promise, express and implied, to establish a stable government. Such action is also in harmony with our frequent declarations that we could not with indifference see Cuba passing into the possession of any foreign power.

#### III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.



The treaty of Paris contained the following provision:

#### ARTICLE I.

Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba. And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

The language of section 3 emphasizes the beneficent intentions of this Government toward Cuba. We ask that Cuba consent that we exercise the "right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence," and "the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty."

By this request we inferentially guarantee "the preservation of Cuban independence" and stable government, and thereby further inferentially disclaim "any disposition or intention" to take Cuban territory. This section is also pursuant to and in harmony with our disclaimer of "intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island" and our promise of pacification contained in our resolution of April 20, 1898.

Our obligations in regard to stable government do not necessarily cease upon our withdrawal from the island. The first establishment of government in the island of Cuba is necessarily experimental and may utterly fail. The ability of the people of Cuba to govern themselves will be on trial.

A civil war in Cuba might furnish as strong an argument for intervention by us as did the war with Spain, with the further obligation of pacification contained in our resolution of April 20, 1898, superadded. In other words, the announcement of the formation of a government by the people of Cuba does not in itself discharge us from our obligations.

#### IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

There ought to be no objection to this.

#### V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

This is a provision for the preservation of the public health of the people of Cuba and of the United States and is proper to be incorporated in a treaty. There is nothing in this proposition restrictive of Cuban independence.

The only restriction proposed is a restriction upon the spread of disease. It is simply proposed that the two governments shall cooperate for the public health of both.

It is a civilized suggestion, which though it may not of right be insisted upon as a condition, and a treaty omitting it might not for that reason fail of ratification, nevertheless it ought to be acceded to by Cuba without demur as being for the common benefit of the people of Cuba and the United States.

#### VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

The Isle of Pines is 40 miles from the Cuban coast, and as I understand has been omitted by the Cuban constitution already framed from the description of the territorial limits of the government.

Our resolution of April 20, 1898, related to "the island" of Cuba. However, the title to the Isle of Pines is by this section properly "left to future adjustment by treaty."

This island is said to contain about 537,600 acres, much of it swamp and the rest of it rolling, sandy pine lands. By the census of 1899 it had a population of 3,199. It was formerly the resort of pirates and was afterwards made a penal colony. It is of little value to Cuba, but might be of value to us as a supply station in case it should become necessary for us to defend the proposed Nicaragua Canal.

#### VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

By this section we propose to the government of Cuba that it sell or lease to us lands for coaling or naval stations to enable us to maintain Cuban independence and to protect the people of Cuba.

By our resolution of April 20, 1898, we assumed the duty of pacification of Cuba. That duty carries with it the duty of aiding the people of Cuba in the establishment of a stable government. With our knowledge of the people of Cuba we can not assume that their first experiment in self-government will be attended with immediate order. Neither can we look into the future and say when they will be able to proceed unaided. Internal disorder would not only invite foreign intervention contrary to our Amer-

ican policy, but would be disastrous to the development and welfare of the people of Cuba.

We prefer to withdraw now and pursuant to our resolution "to leave the government and control of the island to its people," but in so doing it is our duty to be within sufficient hailing distance to aid the government which we have enabled to be organized to succeed and to respond when needed for their protection and the continuance of that order and good government for which we have become responsible not only to Cuba by the resolution of 1898, but to the world by virtue of the Paris treaty. Ours is a continuing obligation from which we can not absolve ourselves at once. If, as stated, in effect, by the Supreme Court, we are the trustees for the people of Cuba, our trust is not fully consummated and our duty is not fully discharged until order is established.

#### VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

This section simply proposes the reducing of our understanding to writing, so that there shall be no future misunderstanding as to what we have agreed on—no room left for conflict of testimony, difference of construction, or defect of memory.

It is, perhaps, superfluous to speak of gratitude. Among men the very generosity which prompts a favor makes impossible a reminder of reciprocal obligations.

In the light of history since April 1898 it would seem that the people of Cuba ought to hasten to inquire of the United States what return they could make to us for what we have done and would scorn the very appearance of withholding anything which a nation prompted by the motives which animated us in our warfare in their behalf might ask. But sentiments like these seem to find no part in international dealings. The cold and formal outlines of a treaty are never softened by sentiment. All things proceed by rule of action except when driven out of true by partisanship.

We went to war with Spain for a cause unique in history—the cause of humanity—and above the graves of thousands of reconcentrados starved to death by Weyler's order, above the harbor where the *Maine* lies buried, we are doing our best to raise the monument of Cuba—reorganized, regenerated, and free. We are proceeding as we began—in the cause of humanity.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD].

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the House is compelled to act upon it, is a striking illustration of a most vicious and iniquitous practice in national legislation. An Army bill, which must be passed in order to provide for absolutely necessary expenditures, comes down from the Senate with a large number of amendments which originated in the Senate, and in order to pass the bill under the rule just adopted we are compelled to vote for all of the amendments whether they do or not meet our approval. This is a method invariably adopted for securing the passage of obnoxious measures which otherwise would not meet with the approval of the House. The principal measure is simply used as a vessel to sustain cargoes that otherwise would sink of their own weight.

This bill has two amendments of great moment, of far-reaching consequences, that have never been considered by any committee on the part of the House, and must be accepted after only two hours of debate. One relates to the Philippine Archipelago, one to Cuba. While I have grave doubts as to our constitutional right to delegate legislative power, as is clearly contemplated by the Philippine amendment, I should vote for the bill with this amendment if I could do so without at the same time being obliged to vote for the Cuban amendment, in which I do not believe. The Philippine amendment contemplates a change from military rule to civil rule, and is an advance over existing conditions. It does not add to, but limits executive power.

I am firmly of the opinion that the person or persons that may discharge the duties devolved upon them by this amendment will be restrained and controlled therein by all of the constitutional limitations and guaranties protecting life, liberty, and property. I do not for a moment believe that they can, even if they desired, exercise absolute, arbitrary, autocratic power. We may have occasion to remember that by this amendment we legislate for the Philippines. While I should vote for this amendment if it stood alone, I believe that a form of territorial government following the lines of the territorial governments created for Louisiana in 1804 and Florida in 1822, would, from every consideration, be much more desirable. It would commit us to nothing to which this amendment does not commit us, and it could not fail to be a much more potent influence in securing peace in the archipelago—a consummation certainly most "devoutly to be wished."

The Cuban amendment does not seem to me to be in accord with the solemnly declared and frequently reiterated policy of the Republic relative to Cuba. Beside this, it practically assumes grave responsibilities which do not now exist. The position which the



Republic now sustains to Cuba is, I believe, fairly and truthfully stated by the Supreme Court in the opinion in the Neely case, in which the court says unanimously, speaking through Mr. Justice Harlan:

The legislative and executive branches of the Government, by the joint resolutions of April 20, 1898, expressly disclaimed any purpose to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, "except for the pacification thereof," and asserted the determination of the United States, that object being accomplished, to leave the government and control of Cuba to its own people. All that has been done in relation to Cuba has had that end in view; and, so far as the court is informed by the public history of the relations of this court with that island, nothing has been done inconsistent with the declared object of the war with Spain.

Again, giving a perspicuous judicial statement of the clear duty of the United States in this exigency:

But as between the United States and Cuba, that island is territory held in trust for the inhabitants in Cuba, to whom it rightfully belongs and to whose exclusive control it will be surrendered when a stable government shall have been established by their voluntary action.

The Cuban amendment, which is said to contain our ultimatum to Cuba, does not, in my opinion, contemplate surrendering "exclusive control" of Cuba to the "inhabitants of Cuba," for whom the territory is now "held in trust," "when a stable government shall have been established by their voluntary action;" but, on the contrary, it seems to me that it clearly intends to perpetuate our control over the island and its inhabitants.

In the third section we require Cuba to consent to our right to intervene for the "maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty." This does not in terms require them to consent that we may intervene "for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty," only to maintain "a government adequate" for that purpose; but practically it makes us the judges of the existence of the exigency that justifies our intervention, and the right to intervene for that purpose submits to our control the government which they establish.

It is not a very long step from the right to intervene to the obligation to exercise that right when its exercise is demanded by those in whose interests it may be assumed the right was conceded. No one can tell under what circumstances it might be insisted by foreign capital, to illustrate, that the Cuban government was inadequate to protect property and individual liberty, or when it might be asserted by a foreign government in the interests of the personal or property rights of its citizens residing therein or having relations therewith that the government was inadequate, and we must protect them in that regard. In section V, in case of any change as to sanitation, they have no power to make it except with our consent, thus being clearly subordinate to our control in this particular.

It may be conceded that if we were to exercise control over them, this subject, above all others, would be the one over which it should be exercised.

The desirability or importance of control does not demonstrate the existence of the right when the rights of the parties are derived from their declared purposes. In section seven the purpose for which the coaling or naval stations are to be acquired is stated as follows: "To enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense." When we acquire and occupy territory "to protect the people thereof" it is not a strained construction to hold that we are by virtue thereof bound "to protect the people thereof."

This is the principal purpose of any government that may be established "by the inhabitants of Cuba."

Against whom are we "to protect the people thereof," and what occasion is there for protecting "the people thereof" if we maintain, as we insist we wish to do under section three, a "government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty?" What legitimate occasion have we to "protect the people thereof" when there is or ought to be in existence a "free, independent government established by its people" for that very purpose? Are we to protect them against internal disorder, against their own government, or against foreign governments? Evidently the rights to be conceded by section three were not sufficiently broad and comprehensive, and in order to make our control more absolute and complete this extremely general language was added in section seven.

These three sections clearly involve, as it seems to me, a perpetuation of our control instead of a surrender of "exclusive control" to the inhabitants of Cuba, which the Supreme Court has said is the purpose for which we now hold the possession. This amendment goes further than we are required to go, and assumes obligations indefinite, undetermined, far-reaching, much beyond any duties devolved upon us by the treaty. Article XVI of the treaty provides: "It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof, but it will, upon the termination of such occupancy, advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations." It can not be successfully denied, as it seems to me, that this clause in the treaty clearly contemplates that at some time in the near

future our occupancy of this island would terminate, and that at that time our obligations with "respect to Cuba" would also terminate, and our only obligation then remaining would be to "advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations."

Under the ultimatum, however, all of these obligations are not only continued, but they will prove to be very greatly enlarged. We are not to escape the "ills we have," but "fly to others that we know not of."

By this ultimatum we, in effect, assume a protectorate over Cuba. This is a new departure in our national policy, as that is a power which we have never before undertaken to exercise and which it has been insisted was entirely out of the question in connection with the Philippines.

I do not believe a protectorate can be predicated upon the Monroe doctrine, nor do I believe that we can constitutionally exercise such a power. If we can, we can exercise it wherever the Monroe doctrine applies, and it is conceded that applies to the whole continent. Are we to exercise protectorates in time over all the South American governments as occasion may arise? The assumption of such vast responsibilities no one who loves our institutions can contemplate without serious misgivings.

I believe in the sincerity and honesty of the declaration of April 20, 1898, with which we embarked upon the war with Spain. It has been consistently reasserted on many solemn occasions since. The deliberate and emphatic declarations of our peace commissioners during their negotiations, which resulted in the treaty of Paris, in October and November, 1898, six months after the declaration of war, when the frenzy, if any there was, may be assumed to have subsided, fully justify the conclusions of the Supreme Court. Insisting upon the capacity of the Cubans to govern themselves, and repudiating an intimation on the part of the Spanish commissioners that the opposite was true, they said on October 27, 1898:

The American commissioners are unaware of the ground on which it is asserted in the Spanish memorandum that the United States has been compelled to admit that the Cuban people are as yet unfit for the enjoyment of full liberty and sovereignty. It is true that an intimation of such unfitness was made in the note of the Spanish Government on the 22d of July last. The Government of the United States, in its reply of the 30th of July, declared that it did not share the apprehensions of Spain in this regard, but that it recognized, in the present distracted and prostrate condition of the island, brought about by the wars that waged there, aid and guidance would be necessary. (The treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, pp. 102-103.)

They do not seek to evade this conclusion, as they repeat the declaration on November 9, 1898. (Ibid., p. 143.)

The character of our occupation was clearly stated in the negotiations. Spain insisted that the United States was to receive the sovereignty over Cuba, hold it for the necessary time, and then leave it "at the disposal of the government that may be constituted in Cuba." Our commissioners exercised scrupulous care in repelling the idea that we were to exercise any sovereignty over Cuba, even for a temporary purpose, saying, October 14, 1898:

The American commissioners understand the Spanish memorandum to maintain that their Government, prior to the war, demanded of Spain, in effect, if not in words, the relinquishment of her sovereignty over Cuba to the United States. \* \* \* The precise words of this demand are "that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and Cuban waters," and the demand is accompanied by the declaration that the United States in taking the step "disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people, under such free and independent government as they may establish."

From the demand thus fully set forth in the Spanish memorandum extracts the assertion by the United States of its determination "to leave the government and control of the island to its people;" and, omitting both what precedes and follows, construes that assertion as a demand that such relinquishment must be made through them (the United States). The demand, as a whole, however, carefully and clearly excludes this construction. Not only is the assertion preceded in the same sentence by an express disclaimer on the part of the United States of any disposition or intention to take the sovereignty of the island, but the assertion itself includes an express declaration of a determination to allow the island to remain after pacification "under such free and independent government" as may be established by its people. (Ibid., p. 47.)

A government which we dominate, which is expressly subjected to our control by this ultimatum, which we do not propose to allow established except upon such conditions, can not with any propriety be said to be a "free and independent government established by its people."

The Spanish commissioners still insisted upon our assuming this qualified sovereignty (Ibid., pp. 83-85), and on October 27, 1898, our commissioners squarely denied the claim, saying:

The American commissioners have never denied that the island of Cuba will, upon its evacuation by the Spanish forces, come into possession of the authorities of the United States; but this possession is to be by no means confounded with the sovereignty of the island, which the United States has long since declared to Spain an intention not to assume. The United States will take possession of the island for the purpose of pacifying it, but not as titular sovereign, and it is not to be charged with proposing to reduce it to the condition of a "desert territory in Africa" merely because it declines to assume the character of such sovereign. (Ibid., p. 98.)

The pure, lofty, and disinterested purpose which inspired all of



the acts of the United States throughout was proudly and truthfully stated by our commissioners on October 27, 1898. They said:

It is not necessary to recite the record of the events which followed that demand (involved in the declaration of war), well known to the members of this commission, and which are now a part of the history of the world. It is true that the enforced relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty will result in the freedom and independence of the island of Cuba, and not in the aggrandizement of the United States. \* \* \* Not having taken up arms for its own advancement, having refrained from acquiring sovereignty over Cuba, the United States now seeks to attain a peace consistent with its ends and purpose in waging war.

Its relations to Cuba have been those of a people suffering without reward or the hope thereof. (Ibid, p. 107.)

It would be doing great violence to the character for candor and probity of the distinguished men who represented us if we were to assume that they then contemplated that we should take occasion, while carrying out these sublimely disinterested purposes, to aggrandize ourselves by the forcible acquisition of coaling or naval stations for our "own defense."

Further references are unnecessary. There is no discordant note; no intimation or inference that is inconsistent with the purity and sincerity of our holy purpose. The negotiations breathe it in every line and paragraph. We do not stand on equal terms. Cuba is powerless. She is compelled to accept our terms. Every consideration requires us to be consistent, sincere, and generous. We can not afford to aggrandize ourselves. The honor of our country is at stake in the fulfillment of these great purposes, in their letter and in their spirit.

I do not think this history can be brushed out with a wave of the hand on the ground that it was an improvident declaration hysterically made when Congress was at a white heat, responding to a wave of frenzied excitement sweeping over the country. I concede that hasty action is likely to be ill-considered action. I hope the action taken to-day under the pressure of the nearing close of the session and an inevitable special session if this bill fails may not prove to be action taken in haste, of which we may have occasion to repent at our leisure. Nor can it be eliminated, in my judgment, because some statesmen may have an itching palm for Cuba with its wealth.

If it were the purpose of the Cuban amendment—which I do not assert—to impose conditions that would compel the annexation of Cuba, I am not prepared to say that it is not well adapted to produce that result. Such a result, thus accomplished, would humiliate our common country to the last degree. I hope to be able to still cherish the opinion asserted in the following colloquy by a distinguished citizen of Wisconsin in another body:

Mr. SPOONER. Has the Senator any suspicion in his mind that the pledge made in the resolution passed by Congress as to the temporary character of our occupation in Cuba is not to be kept?

Mr. HALE. I have.

Mr. SPOONER. Kept not simply to the letter, but kept in spirit?

Mr. HALE. I have very grave suspicion, Mr. President.

Mr. SPOONER. Then, Mr. President, the Senator is a pessimist, beyond any I have ever met.

Mr. HALE. Now, let me say to the Senator I think there are very powerful influences in this country—I think they are largely located in New York City, I think they are largely speculative and connected with money-making enterprises—that are determined that we shall never give up Cuba. I am profoundly impressed and profoundly depressed by the fact that I find in hundreds of quarters a determination that we shall never withdraw from Cuba, but shall retain her as a possession of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. It will never turn out, my friend from Maine, that any man in any country can point to the Teller resolution and say with truth that it was a legislative lie.

Mr. HALE. I hope so.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator need not hope so; he had better know so.

Mr. HALE. I do not know.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, he ought to know.

May we all "know." I do not feel at liberty to support this bill with an amendment which is thus at variance with our declared and construed purposes with respect to Cuba.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] exhausted his time?

The SPEAKER. The time on that side is exhausted.

Mr. HULL. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. HULL. I will occupy three minutes of that time. I hope the Speaker will call me down if I exceed that limit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will proceed for three minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, this is probably a bad time for a man to refer to any personal matters; but for the last two days gentlemen in both branches of Congress have aimed to make me the target of their criticism on account of a business enterprise. This was started by William J. Bryan, while a candidate for the Presidency. When the campaign was in progress last year, it was published over my district and my State, and was met there by a full statement of fact, answered by an increased majority. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I am the same man that is connected with the Philippine Lumber Company, and that I have something invested in that enterprise. I will say further to

this House that I have not, nor has that company, ever asked one favor of the Government of the United States; and we do not propose to do so. Our dealings there are with men who have titles in fee simple of long standing. The business is entirely legitimate.

And I want to say to this House and the country that whenever the time comes that I am not permitted to invest in a legitimate enterprise I would prefer to leave Congress to being a drone, dependent only on politics for my living. [Applause.] I will say further to the gentleman from Tennessee, and to this House, that while the campaign was on, the company with which I am associated called a halt in their enterprise and notified every one of the stockholders that if Bryan should be elected not one dollar would we invest in the Philippines, but if McKinley should be elected we would invest all the money that we pleased, believing it would have a favorable return by the restoration of order and good government in the Philippines. [Applause on the Republican side; derisive applause on the Democratic side.]

Bryan's election would mean disorder and anarchy in the islands. McKinley's election would mean order and thrift.

Under the one I would not be willing to invest in any legitimate enterprise; under the other the ax and the sawmill would be encouraged, labor benefited, and civilization advanced.

Now, why? Because the one man was trying to run the country on wind and the other believed in legitimate enterprise. [Great confusion in the Hall.] I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair could not hear, owing to the confusion, what the gentleman said.

Mr. HULL. All the time I have—eleven minutes, as I understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for eleven minutes.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all surprising that the gentleman from Colorado should be perplexed, as he says he is, when he recalls certain language in the Declaration of Independence, and when he remembers some portion of the history of the Republic of a great many years ago. He quoted:

We believe it to be self-evident that all men were created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. Speaker, these sentences were written by Thomas Jefferson, the old apostle of Democracy, and yet when he wrote these sentences he was the owner of more than a score of slaves that he could drive to unrequited toil with the taskmaster's lash. He could sell wife from husband and child from its mother's arms.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not yield. I remember that when George Washington assembled the tattered patriots of his army to hear read in general orders the Declaration of Independence, as he stood, the cynosure of all eyes, and as his adjutant read, he must have recollected, when these words fell upon his ears, that he was then the largest slaveholder in the United States. But the gentleman from Colorado is not the only man that is perplexed by this language when he attempts the application that he makes.

Does any man suppose that when the fathers of the Republic—when these two distinguished heroes and patriots wrote or listened to this language they gave it the interpretation that men wholly unfit, that men uneducated, that men unaccustomed to self-restraint, that men without capacity for government, inexperienced in government, should govern? No man believes that.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not yield. I do not want to be discourteous, but have only ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that these gentlemen have abused the language of the Declaration of Independence long enough. How sincere are you when you quote these passages, you men who to-day are striving by all your powers to rob American citizens of their right of self-government? [Great applause on the Republican side.]

You Virginians that prate about the Declaration of Independence, that quote Jefferson and Washington, that voice the claim with pride that your political lineage comes from them, and you of Maryland, and you of South Carolina, and you of North Carolina, and you of Alabama, and of Mississippi, what do you mean when you aid or quietly sit by and see men driven from the status of citizenship, citizens so declared by the Constitution, robbed of the power to vote and of all participation in political power? [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?



Mr. CARMACK. Do you believe they are violating the Declaration of Independence?

Mr. HEPBURN. I have not time for colloquy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). I must decline to yield, no matter how interesting to me a political conversation is always with my friend from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is out of order. The gentleman has declined to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand. I addressed the Chair and requested the gentleman's permission to interrupt him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declined to yield in advance.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, this debate has called out from certain gentlemen upon the floor declarations that it seems to me ought to be understood. The American people have the right to demand that it should be understood. One gentleman in connection with members of another deliberative body has used the word "connivance," the word "connive."

Ah, there is something sinister in that word. It is an uncanny word, Mr. Speaker. What does it mean? It means "silent or indirect assent, especially to wrong doing;" "forbearing to notice what one should antagonize;" "passive encouragement or cooperation;" "guilty assent to a wrongful or criminal act during its occurrence."

These are the meanings of that word. Let me explain how and under what circumstances that unseemly word is applied by a distinguished Democrat, who always uses the English language with wonderful correctness—with wonderful vigor; who selects words that convey his exact shade of meaning as perhaps no other English scholar does, or at least of any that I have ever heard. Let us see what it means. In another body there were two or three measures pending, and by perhaps adroit management the Republican managers had placed this bill that we are now considering in precedence of others. What were they? One was the river and harbor bill; one was the bill making appropriations for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition; the third the Army bill now before us.

All through the weeks past we have heard declarations, loud, vigorous, and continuing, that this bill, with its political amendments relating to Cuba and the Philippines—the sum of all infamies, as we were told here and in the other Chamber—could not pass; that there were Senators there that had the power to put a veto upon it; that they intended to exercise that power. All the newspapers have been replete with their declarations of the endurance they would manifest, and the certainty that they in the end would prevent, by the methods we all know they command, the passage of this objectionable bill—

The SPEAKER. It is the duty of the Chair to remind the gentleman from Iowa that commenting upon the action of members of the other House is entirely out of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to comment upon the extraordinary language of the gentleman from Missouri. I want to quote, in the light of what I have said, if I may say it, in the light of your knowledge of conditions. I want to call your attention to this remarkable language of the gentleman. It must have been applied to Democrats; it could not have been applied to Republicans, because Republicans are and have been favorable to this bill; it is their legislation.

Here is the language of the gentleman from Missouri, already referred to by the gentleman from Ohio:

There is thrust into this Chamber now, by the tyranny of the majority, by the connivance of others who had power and did not use it, a question which can not be considered here, but which is to be settled here. In the closing hours of this session the body which could have prevented, the men who could have barred from this Chamber these great questions, for reasons of their own which I have not time to bring into light, and upon which I do not care now to enter—for reasons of their own, yielding to inducements sufficiently powerful to them and with them, have allowed this measure to come with these amendments to this House.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, how strange is that language coming from the gentleman from Missouri, intense partisan that he is—so prone to censure his political opponent; so prone to sustain his political ally. How intense must be his feelings if he intends to apply this bitter language to his own political associates in another body.

But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not content with the language I have quoted. He continues:

And here, with the representatives of the American people shackled with trades and bargains and connivance—with cringing and bending of the knee that thrift may follow fawning—the rights of the American people are to be frittered away, their Constitution is to be disregarded, the people in the far-away Philippines are to be outraged, the risk of war in Cuba is to be hazarded, and all, all that those subservient enough to do it may register the decrees of imperial majesty here in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, am I not right in speaking of the language of the gentleman as remarkable? Have you ever heard its like in this body? Is there another instance in which the gentleman from

Missouri or any other gentleman has so lashed his political friends? But even this is not all. Again I quote from the gentleman:

If I had the time I would be glad to discuss this infamous measure. I would be glad to discuss the infamous procedure, the infamous surrender, the infamous cowardice, the infamous trading and trafficking, the infamous disregard of everything sacred and holy and decent and honorable and glorious in these United States of America. But the time is lacking.

The people abroad, perhaps, in their day (for their day, I hope, in the good providence of God is coming), the people probably abroad may brand as they deserve and may lash from public places as they ought to do, the recreant men—men in appearance—recreant creatures who are ready now to surrender everything and forego everything that is decent, honorable, and constitutional and right—everything that has tended to make our nation glorious—and who resort willingly to everything that may make it infamous now and in all the hereafter. I commend to the tyrants here, I commend to the sycophants and the traders and the traffickers elsewhere, the plunder that they get.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that the intense indignation of the gentleman can not be entertained for his opponents alone. His lance is not leveled at them. When he tells us that the political amendments are placed in the bill "by the connivance of others, who had the power to prevent and did not use it," who does he mean? Surely not the "tyrants of the majority," for he says there "were others."

Oh, Mr. Speaker, how much of uncertainty and doubt the gentleman could have relieved us of if he had only told the House who "the others" were—"the others" who aided in "the infamous procedure" of passing this bill. Who are the men who participated in "the infamous surrender?" Who are the men who exhibited "the infamous cowardice?" Who are the "men who had the power to prevent and failed to use it?" They are not in this House. Here interminable talk is not possible. Here we have rules.

No one in this House has played the bravo and informed the public of their intent to talk this bill to its death—to talk to the end of the session. Here it was known they would not be permitted to so prevent legislation.

Again, here there has been no situation that could justify the gentleman's charge that for a consideration any member could have done or omitted to do anything for an ignoble motive. Here the Army bill did not block the way to other legislation. Here the river and harbor bill and the Louisiana exposition bill, that contained the plums and the plunder, were not impeded by the Army bill; so that the language of the gentleman could not apply to members of this House. He must have intended to apply it to "others." What were the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that influenced "the others?"

Who has received the "plunder?" Who are the men who have taken the bribe—the bribe for failing to do what they might have done? Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we will never know. In fact, the gentleman, under the rules, could not inform us. He has done the best he could. He has told us the criminals are not the "tyrannous majority." He has told us the crime was not committed in this House, but in some other body, where "the others" had the power that they did not use. It could not be here, for here the minority have no power they have not used.

Mr. Speaker, I can conceive the bitter reprehension the gentleman may have for men who will do the things the gentleman has described in such bitter terms, even when they act in obedience to party dictates and to their best convictions of what is right; but I can not conceive the contempt, the unutterable loathing, he must feel for men who do the same things—deserting their party and their convictions and their sense of duty for base and sordid motives—for bribes, for plunder: men who consent that a necessary money bill may be "loaded with infamy," with that which they say is infamous, in order to get it out of the way, in order that they may reach and pass other bills that contain for them that which the gentleman calls "plunder."

And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is right in what he charges, "who shall say him nay?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Iowa that general leave to extend remarks has been given.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LENTZ. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LENTZ. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LENTZ. Will it be in order for the chairman of the Military Committee, the gentleman from Iowa, to vote upon this question, in view of the fact that he is interested in continuing the Philippine war.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.



Mr. HAY and others. Yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 137, answered "present" 4, not voting 51; as follows:

## YEAS—161.

Acheson,	Dick,	Kerr, Md.	Rosenberg,
Adams,	Dovener,	Kerr, Ohio.	Russell,
Aldrich,	Eddy,	Ketcham,	Shattuc,
Alexander,	Emerson,	Knox,	Shelden,
Allen, Me.	Esch,	Lacey,	Sherman,
Babcock,	Fletcher,	Lane,	Showalter,
Bailey, Kans.	Fordney,	Lawrence,	Sibley,
Baker,	Foss,	Linney,	Smith, Ill.
Barham,	Fowler,	Littauer,	Smith, Iowa
Barney,	Freer,	Long,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bartholdt,	Gamble,	Loudenslager,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bishop,	Gardner, Mich.	Lovering,	Southard,
Boreing,	Gardner, N. J.	Lybrand,	Spalding,
Boutell, Ill.	Gibson,	McCleary,	Sperry,
Bowersock,	Gill,	Mahon,	Sprague,
Brick,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marsh,	Steele,
Bromwell,	Gillett, Mass.	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Brosius,	Graft,	Mesick,	Stewart, N. J.
Brown,	Greene, Mass.	Miller,	* Stewart, N. Y.
Brownlow,	Grosvenor,	Minor,	Stewart, Wis.
Burke, S. Dak.	Grout,	Mondell,	Sulloway,
Burkett,	Grow,	Moody, Mass.	Tawney,
Burleigh,	Hamilton,	Moody, Oreg.	Taylor, Ohio
Butler,	Haugen,	Morgan,	Thomas, Iowa
Calderhead,	Hawley,	Morrell,	Tompkins,
Cannon,	Heatwole,	Morris,	Tongue,
Capron,	Hedge,	Needham,	Van Voorhis,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hemenway,	O'Grady,	Vreeland,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Olmsted,	Wachter,
Conner,	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Wanger,
Corliss,	Hill,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Packer, Pa.	Waters,
Cromer,	Hoffecker,	Parker, N. J.	Watson,
Crumpacker,	Hopkins,	Payne,	Weaver,
Curtis,	Howell,	Pearce, Mo.	Weeks,
Cushman,	Hull,	Pearre,	Weymouth,
Dahle,	Jack,	Phillips,	Wright,
Dalzell,	Jenkins,	Prince,	Young,
Davenport, S. A.	Jones, Wash.	Pugh,	
Davidson,	Joy,	Ray, N. Y.	
Dayton,	Kahn,	Roberts,	

## NAYS—137.

Adamson,	Finley,	McCall,	Ryan, N. Y.
Allen, Ky.	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McClellan,	Ryan, Pa.
Atwater,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McCulloch,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	Fleming,	McDowell,	Scudder,
Ball,	Foster,	McLain,	Shackelford,
Bankhead,	Fox,	McRae,	Shafroth,
Barber,	Gaines,	Maddox,	Sheppard,
Bellamy,	Gayle,	Mann,	Sims,
Benton,	Gilbert,	May,	Slayden,
Brantley,	Gordon,	Meekison,	Smith, Ky.
Breazeale,	Green, Pa.	Meyer, La.	Snodgrass,
Brenner,	Griffith,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Brundidge,	Hall,	Moon,	Stallings,
Burke, Tex.	Hay,	Muller,	Stark,
Burleson,	Henry, Miss.	Naphen,	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett,	Henry, Tex.	Newlands,	Sulzer,
Caldwell,	Howard,	Norton, Ohio	Sutherland,
Carmack,	Jett,	Norton, S. C.	Swanson,
Clayton, Ala.	Johnston,	Otey,	Talbert,
Cochran, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Pierce, Tenn.	Tate,
Cooney,	King,	Polk,	Terry,
Cooper, Tex.	Kitchin,	Quarles,	Thayer,
Cowherd,	Kleberg,	Ransdell,	Thomas, N. C.
Cox,	Klutz,	Rhea, Ky.	Turner,
Crowley,	Lamb,	Rhea, Va.	Underwood,
Cusack,	Lanham,	Richardson, Ala.	Vandiver,
Davenport, S. W.	Latimer,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wheeler,
Davis,	Lentz,	Ridgely,	Williams, J. R.
De Armond,	Lester,	Riordan,	Williams, W. E.
De Graffenreid,	Little,	Rixey,	Williams, Miss.
Denny,	Livingston,	Robb,	Zenor,
Dinsmore,	Lloyd,	Robinson, Ind.	Ziegler,
Dougherty,	Loud,	Robinson, Nebr.	
Driggs,	McAleer,	Rucker,	
Driscoll,		Ruppert,	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cooper, Wis.	Cummings,	Littlefield,	Smith, H. C.
--------------	-----------	--------------	--------------

## NOT VOTING—51.

Allen, Miss.	Chanler,	Lassiter,	Small,
Bartlett,	Clark,	Levy,	Sparkman,
Bell,	Clayton, N. Y.	Lorimer,	Stokes,
Berry,	Crump,	McDermott,	Taylor, Ala.
Bingham,	Davey,	Metcalf,	Thropp,
Boutelle, Me.	Elliot,	Mudd,	Underhill,
Bradley,	Faris,	Neville,	Wadsworth,
Brewer,	Fitzpatrick,	Noonan,	White,
Broussard,	Gaston,	Pearson,	Wilson, Idaho
Bull,	Glynn,	Powers,	Wilson, N. Y.
Burton,	Graham,	Reeder,	Wilson, S. C.
Campbell,	Griggs,	Reeves,	Woods,
Catchings,	Landis,	Robertson, La.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. LEVY.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

For the balance of the day:

Mr. FARIS with Mr. BELL.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. GASTON.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. DAVEY.

On this vote:

Mr. BULL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. POWER with Mr. CUMMINGS.

During the roll call, after the name of Mr. HULL had been called:

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Iowa, having admitted that he has an interest in this matter, is not entitled to vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already voted. The point of order is overruled.

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, there was so much confusion during the call, and the vote being of so much importance, I ask a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it unnecessary—the difference is so great.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LENTZ. I find in the Manual that "where the private interests of a member are concerned in a question" pending before the House "he is to withdraw." Now I make the point of order that, by his own admission, the gentleman from Iowa is interested in this question.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman will also find in the Digest that it is the uniform practice that each gentleman must be the judge of that for himself. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

## INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a final conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and that the statement only be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from New York if the conferees have attempted to engraft upon the Indian appropriation bill any treaty between the Dawes Commission and the Chickasaw Indians.

Mr. SHERMAN. None whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12904) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 51 and 52; that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 45 and 56, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "payments," in line 18 of said amendment, insert "gratuities;" at the end of said amendment, after the word "passed," in line 20, add the following: "Proceedings shall be commenced by petition verified by the attorney for said Indians who appears for and on their behalf, and said case shall have preference and be advanced on the docket of said court; and if said court shall find that said bands preserve their loyalty to the United States, they shall ascertain and state the amount that would be due to said Indians on account of said annuities had said act of Congress of February 16, 1863, not been passed, stating in connection therewith what credits should be charged against said annuities on account of the lands, appropriations, payments, gratuities, or other provisions as hereinbefore stated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. S. SHERMAN,  
CHARLES CURTIS,  
JOHN S. LITTLE,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN M. THURSTON,  
O. H. PLATT,

R. F. PETTIGREW,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

The House recedes from amendment No. 45, which amendment provides that where the proper officers of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations fail to appoint town-site commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior may make such appointment.

The House recedes from amendment No. 56, which amendment provides for a closing of the rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes.

The House recedes, from amendment No. 62, which amendment refers to the Court of Claims for examination and a report to Congress of its opinion thereon the claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton band of Indians against the United States.

The Senate recedes from amendment No. 52, which was a provision relating to mineral lands on Executive reservations. The Senate also recedes from amendment No. 51, providing for a further survey of the Gila River, the last amendment being the one in which the House refused to concur on the 23th ultimo.

The conference report was then agreed to.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House



of Representatives that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

On February 28, 1901:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing articles imported from foreign countries, for the sole purpose of exhibition at the San Antonio International Fair and at the Texas State Fair and Dallas Exposition, to be held in the cities of San Antonio, Tex., and Dallas, Tex., to be imported free of duty, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury;

H. R. 4718. An act to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2473. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Fouts;

H. R. 5639. An act granting a pension to Harlin Keeling;

H. R. 6417. An act granting a pension to Eliza C. Johnson;

H. R. 9526. An act granting a pension to N. Marietta Chapman;

H. R. 10046. An act granting a pension to Rosa Cox;

H. R. 10995. An act granting a pension to William Mitchell;

H. R. 11085. An act granting a pension to Mary M. Sprandel;

H. R. 12121. An act granting a pension to Caroline H. Wright;

H. R. 12304. An act granting a pension to Mary B. Whiteley;

H. R. 12434. An act granting a pension to Marie Barton Greene;

H. R. 12686. An act granting a pension to John W. Conely;

H. R. 12775. An act granting a pension to Sarah Miller;

H. R. 13160. An act granting a pension to Sarah M. Lowell;

H. R. 13567. An act granting a pension to Martha M. Stephens;

H. R. 154. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shott;

H. R. 2506. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kemper;

H. R. 3233. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas B. Ireland;

H. R. 3754. An act granting an increase of pension to Solomon Delzell;

H. R. 2820. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar Hill;

H. R. 3883. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Ransom;

H. R. 4232. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Volkner;

H. R. 6503. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gross;

H. R. 8380. An act granting an increase of pension to Reamus G. Morris;

H. R. 8577. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Hare;

H. R. 9584. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Bell;

H. R. 10331. An act granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus A. Gifford;

H. R. 10382. An act granting an increase of pension to James Mason;

H. R. 10689. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Falkoner;

H. R. 10694. An act granting an increase of pension to Katharine J. Gilman;

H. R. 10718. An act granting an increase of pension to James Gatton;

H. R. 10748. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius Sporleder;

H. R. 10978. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus L. Chetlain;

H. R. 11529. An act granting an increase of pension to Don Farrington;

H. R. 11618. An act granting an increase of pension to John Burns;

H. R. 11798. An act granting an increase of pension to Lealdes F. Lavery;

H. R. 11807. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Bliss;

H. R. 12180. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilbert L. Pierce;

H. R. 12883. An act granting an increase of pension to Condly Menalis;

H. R. 12997. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Young;

H. R. 13088. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Brunette;

H. R. 13214. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Hansel;

H. R. 13447. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Eason; and

H. R. 12456. An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia.

On March 1, 1901:

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar; and

H. R. 13575. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12904) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

DANIEL COONAN.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill (S. 3283) for the relief of Daniel Coonan, and I ask that the reading of the report be omitted and only the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reading of the report will be omitted.

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes between the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3283) for the relief of Daniel Coonan, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the word "pensions;" and the House agree to the same.

A. B. CAPRON,

F. C. STEVENS,

THOS. M. JETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. C. BURROWS,

F. E. WARREN,

F. M. COCKRELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

The foregoing act, having passed the Senate, was amended in the House by adding the following proviso: "Provided, That no pay, bounty, pension, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

The Senate disagreed to this House amendment, whereupon a conference was ordered.

The conferees have agreed that the said proviso be stricken out and the following be enacted in lieu thereof: "Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

This is the usual proviso adopted for such bills, and is the same as adopted by the House, with the exception that the word "pension" is stricken out.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### DELINQUENT CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13067) to enlarge the powers of the courts of the District of Columbia in cases involving delinquent children, and for other purposes, and I ask that the reading of the report be omitted and that the statement only be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that the reading of the report be omitted and that the statement only be read. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13067) to enlarge the powers of the courts of the District of Columbia in cases involving delinquent children, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of line 1 of said amendment insert "of sufficient financial ability," and in line 3 strike out "willfully and unnecessarily;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. BABCOCK,

JOHN J. JENKINS,

ADOLPH MEYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES McMILLAN,

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM,

RICHARD R. KENNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of Representatives make the following statement of the result of the conference with the managers on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to House bill H. R. 13067:

The conferees agreed upon amendment numbered 1 with an amendment providing that persons amenable to the provisions of this act shall have sufficient financial ability, and also struck out the words "willfully and unlawfully," which were considered objectionable.

The House recedes from the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, and 6.

The Senate recedes from amendment numbered 4, the provisions of which were considered too drastic and undesirable, in that it provided that a person failing to obey the orders of the court for the maintenance and support of



any child under 14 years of age should be deemed a fugitive from justice and subject to indictment.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

#### PROTECTION OF BIRDS AND GAME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I also present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 11881) to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of birds, preservation of game, and for the prevention of its sale during certain closed seasons in the District of Columbia," and I ask that the reading of the report be omitted and the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11881) to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of birds, preservation of game, and for the prevention of its sale during certain closed seasons in the District of Columbia," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1, line 11, of the bill, strike out "1st day of February" and insert "15th day of March;" and on page 2, line 13, of the bill, strike out "1st day of February" and insert "15th day of March;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3.

J. W. BABCOCK,

JOHN J. JENKINS,

ADOLPH MEYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES McMILLAN,

J. H. GALLINGER,

THOMAS S. MARTIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of Representatives make the following statement of the result of the conference with the managers on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendments to the House bill 11881:

The House agrees to the amendments of the Senate with an amendment providing that the closed season, during which any partridge, otherwise quail, prairie chicken, otherwise pinnated grouse, may not be killed, exposed for sale, or had in possession of any party in the District of Columbia, shall be between the 15th day of March and the 1st day of November in each year, in place of between the 1st day of February and the 1st day of November.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### DISPOSITION OF LAND IN OKLAHOMA.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill (H. R. 12901) to supplement existing laws relating to the disposition of land with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments, with the following amendment:

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

The lands to be opened to settlement and entry under the acts of Congress ratifying said agreements, respectively, shall be so opened by proclamation of the President, and to avoid the contests and conflicting claims which have heretofore resulted from opening similar public lands to settlement and entry, the President's proclamation shall prescribe the manner in which these lands may be settled upon, occupied, and entered by persons entitled thereto under the acts ratifying said agreements, respectively; and no person shall be permitted to settle upon, occupy, or enter any of said lands except as prescribed in such proclamation until after the expiration of sixty days from the time when the same are opened to settlement and entry.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if this amendment is in print?

Mr. LACEY. It is not.

Mr. McRAE. I wish the gentleman would explain it, and I reserve any point of order there may be against it.

Mr. LACEY. It is desired to make some arrangement to prevent an Oklahoma rush or race. A proposition was prepared by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], covering some system of drawing, but the details could not be agreed upon. This is a proposition which permits the President, or the Secretary of the Interior by direction of the President, to prepare some method by which that rush may be avoided.

In the previous rushes there was so much fraud, so much conflict that even to-day there are cases pending on file and not disposed of where two or three or more persons absolutely had their entire lives tied up for seven or eight years in a controversy over a piece of land. It is proposed to give the President the power to make some rules and regulations that will prevent that.

Mr. McRAE. What remedy does the gentleman propose?

Mr. LACEY. We do not attempt to define what the regulation shall be. My own idea would be some system of drawing.

Mr. McRAE. The matter is to be referred to the Secretary of the Interior, under the direction of the President, to prepare some system?

Mr. LACEY. Yes. The bill was carefully prepared by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], but as it was very late in the session it did not secure action in the House.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Has the gentleman stated the only change?

Mr. LACEY. There is one other change—a provision put in by the Secretary of the Interior as to the boundaries of the counties. I do not think that is of much importance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to know whether the privileges of Union soldiers are fully secured in reference to this land?

Mr. LACEY. The privileges which they have by existing law are fully preserved by the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then, as I understand, the bill as amended makes no change in that respect.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LACEY. I ask unanimous consent that a conference with the Senate be requested.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. LACEY, Mr. MONDELL, and Mr. SHAFROTH as conferees on the part of the House.

#### SHIPMENT OF HORSES, ETC., FOR USE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of February 19, 1901, requesting him to furnish that body "all the information in the possession of the State Department relating to the shipment of horses and mules from New Orleans in large numbers for the use of the British army in the war in South Africa."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 1, 1901.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13803. An act to amend section 19 of chapter 252, Twenty-ninth Statutes at Large, approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 10899. An act to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation in the Territory of Arizona;

H. R. 13865. An act relative to the suit instituted for the protection of the interests of the United States in the Potomac River Flats;

H. R. 13801. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902;

H. R. 13707. An act authorizing the Citizens' Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 13850. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902;

H. R. 7571. An act to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to regulate the distribution of public documents to the Library of Congress for its own use and for international exchange;

H. R. 11161. An act to refund excessive postage paid on certain newspapers;

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution providing for the publication of the report of the board of management of the United States Government exhibit at the Tennessee Centennial Exposition;

H. R. 7760. An act for the relief of James Kelly;

H. R. 3819. An act for the relief of the widows and children of William Ryan and John S. Taylor, deceased;

H. R. 12394. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder; and

H. R. 5220. An act for the relief of Charles M. Kennedy.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 323. An act granting homesteaders on abandoned Fort Fetterman Military Reservation, in Wyoming, the right to purchase one quarter section of public land on said reservation as pasture or grazing land;

H. R. 12396. An act to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act; and

H. J. Res. 306. A joint resolution concerning printing of additional copies of the Annual Report of the Geological Survey.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. R. 164. Joint resolution giving the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to provide for the public comfort;

S. 6012. An act to provide an American register for the steam yacht *May*;

S. 5935. An act to authorize the Montgomery and Autauga Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala.; and



S. 6054. An act authorizing the Texas and Pacific Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River, Louisiana.

#### CLAIMS FOR INDIAN DEPREDACTIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following veto message of the President of the United States; which was read:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without approval, House bill No. 3204, entitled "An act to refer certain claims for Indian depredations to the Court of Claims."

General relief has been extended to citizens who have lost property by reason of Indian depredations by the act of March 3, 1891, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine such cases. That act provides for payment for damages growing out of depredations committed by any Indian or Indians belonging to a band, tribe, or nation in amity with the United States, excluding from consideration all claims which originated during the existence of actual hostilities between the United States and the Indian tribe.

In making this discrimination the act of 1891 follows the general principle which has been asserted in all general legislation which has ever been enacted for the payment of claims for property destroyed by Indians. The first act which promised such indemnity, that of May 19, 1790, contained the same restriction, and it was reported in every subsequent general act of Congress dealing with the subject. This policy, which has been clearly manifested from the beginning, is in accord with the recognized principle that a nation is not liable for damage to the private property of its citizens caused by the act of the public enemy. This statute has been thoroughly considered by the Court of Claims and by the Supreme Court and its interpretation fixed, and it has been declared to be in accord not only with the policy of Congress as expressed through the legislation of a century, but with the general principles of international law.

I am informed that the records of the Court of Claims show that the claims of four of the five beneficiaries named in the present bill have been presented to that court under the general law and decided adversely, the court having held that a state of war existed between the United States and the Sioux Indians in the year 1862, when the claims arose. The remaining claim, which originated under the same circumstances and at the same time, would, of course, be subject to the same defense if presented.

The bill provides that these claims shall be sent back to the Court of Claims for trial, according to the principles and rules which governed the commission appointed under the act of February 16, 1863. That act, which was a special act relating to losses occurring during the hostilities of the previous year, did not, of course, impose the requirement of amity, the claims allowed by the commission being paid out of funds belonging to the hostile Indians sequestered by the statute. The effect of this bill if it became a law would be to provide for the payment out of the Treasury of the United States of these claims, which were not presented for payment out of the Indian funds and which have been rejected by the courts under the general law.

There are many hundreds of cases, aggregating a large amount claimed, which have been filed in the Court of Claims, but which are excluded from its jurisdiction for the same reason which necessitated the dismissal of the petitions filed by these claimants. There is no legal obligation on the part of the United States and no promise, express or implied, for the payment of such claims.

The measure of governmental liability is fulfilled by the passage of the act of March 3, 1891, and the prompt payment of the judgments rendered thereunder. To single out for payment a few claims of this large class, to the exclusion of all others, would, in my judgment, be unjust; and such action would also with reason be cited as a precedent for extending governmental aid in all similar cases.

For the reasons given I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 1, 1901.

Mr. MAHON. I move that the message just read be referred, with the accompanying bill, to the Committee on War Claims, and be ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### APPOINTMENT AND PAYMENT OF HOUSE EMPLOYEES.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. NEWLANDS, and Mr. MADDOX as the committee provided for by House resolution No. 439 to frame and report to the next House a bill to regulate the appointment of and payments to the employees of the House of Representatives.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ZIEGLER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the cases of Charnton C. Mullen and George W. Hope (Fifty-sixth Congress), no adverse report having been made.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. METCALF, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for this day on account of sickness.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TO-MORROW.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that from 9 till 11 o'clock to-morrow it shall be in order only to ask unanimous consent or to move to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that the two hours, from 9 till 11 o'clock, be devoted entirely to matters brought up by unanimous consent or under suspension of the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. I want to ask whether that will give the War Claims Committee an opportunity to bring up the resolution sending a number of claims to the Court of Claims?

The SPEAKER. That will depend upon the class of business for which gentlemen are recognized. [Laughter.] The Chair hears no objection to the proposed order; and it is adopted.

The House accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of John Beal against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a final report of inspection of buildings in this city occupied by the War Department—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of a board of officers recommending the purchase of land for barracks and officers' quarters at Fort Schuyler—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DAYTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14309) for the reward of enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2980); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCLEARY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 313) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Dorothea Lynde Dix, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2985); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13910) to remove the record of dishonorable discharges from the military records of John Shamburger, Louis Smith, and Henry Metzger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2982); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5133) for the relief of William D. Rutan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2983); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3598) to enable the President to restore Second Lieut. Henry Ossian Flipper to duty, rank, and status in United States Army, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2981); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEARRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was recommitted the bill of the House (H. R. 13660) relating to the Washington Gaslight Company, and for other purposes, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2984); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14318) authorizing the appointment of a clerk for the district courts of the eastern district of Texas at Sherman and Beaumont, Tex., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 14319) to provide means of determining and expressing the total quantities of all kinds of property in the United States in decimal terms independent of value—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14324) to prevent superannuation and favoritism in the classified civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GROUT: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 91) for



printing hearings on anti-oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial from the legislature of Wisconsin, for repeal of certain war-revenue taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAHLE: A memorial from the legislature of Wisconsin, for repeal of certain war-revenue taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14320) to correct the military record of George L. Hayne, late first lieutenant Company C, First Regiment Louisiana Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14321) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Munger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14322) granting a pension to Martha A. Holingseed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14323) for the relief of Luke Stinnett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of Platteville (Wis.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the passage of House bill No. 12551, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor and National Business League, of Chicago, Ill., opposing the cession of the lands of the States and recommending the Government building of irrigation works—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Fredonia, Kans., against the establishment of the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor and of the National Business League, for the reclamation of the arid lands in the Western States—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Christian, Baptist, and Methodist Episcopal churches of Peru, and 70 citizens of Murray, Nebr., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Munger, of Orange, Tex.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of the National Business League for the reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Young People's Christian Union of St. Paul's Universalist Church of La Crosse, Wis., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petitions of S. P. Hall and others of Plainfield, and Edwin Ferris and others of Montclair, N. J., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Union County, N. J., Woman's Christian Temperance Union for the prohibition of the sale of firearms, opium, and intoxicating liquors to the inhabitants of the New Hebrides and other islands—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petitions of J. R. McFie, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., and G. B. Hubbard and 8 others, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of W. M. Chappell and other citizens of Oakland City, Ind., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of Ulster County, N. Y., in behalf of the passage of the Gillett bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MANN: Petitions of the National Business Men's League and Heath & Milligan Manufacturing Company, of Chicago, Ill., for irrigation of arid lands, and Government to give title to none but actual settlers on any public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor and Iron Moulders' Union of Omaha, Nebr., advocating the holding of the public lands in the West for the benefit of the people and favoring irrigation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of Elizabeth McNeal and others favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions of the National Business League of Chicago, Ill., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Resolutions of the National Business Men's League, for the reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of the Presbyterian churches of Galesburg and Broadlawn, in Traill and Steele counties, N. Dak., for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of citizens of the Twenty-seventh Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Raymilton, Pa., asking for the abolishment of the alcoholic liquor traffic from the continent of Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of citizens of Waterbury and East Haven, Conn., and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Putnam, Conn., for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the National Business Men's League of Chicago, Ill., relating to the reclamation and settlement of Government lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and of National Business League, held at Chicago, favoring appropriations for surveys, dams, and canals throughout the great West—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society of Nelson, Nebr., and A. L. Hunting and 64 others, of Arapahoe, Nebr., for the prohibition of intoxicating liquors in certain islands—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: Petitions of Rev. I. R. Thompson, Rev. W. K. Hall, and certain churches of Newburgh, N. Y., for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wyoming, N. Y., and of Friends' Church of Batavia, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the National Business League, favoring the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

#### SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

#### REPAIR OF BARRACKS, MARINE CORPS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for "repair of barracks, Marine Corps," for the fiscal year 1901, \$17,500. Does the Senator from Iowa desire to have it printed or simply referred?

Mr. ALLISON. It need not be printed. The deficiency appropriation bill will be reported this morning, and the communication may just as well lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will lie on the table.

#### INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to the resolution of the 28th ultimo, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredation cases; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the third annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the